# FINAL SAN BERNARDINO COUNTYWIDE TRANSPORTATION PLAN

**Prepared by:** 



San Bernardino Associated Governments 1170 West Third Street, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor San Bernardino, CA 92410-1715

September 2015

# **SANBAG Mission Statement**

To enhance the quality of life for all residents, SANBAG will:

- Improve cooperative regional planning
- Develop an accessible, efficient, multi-modal transportation system
- Strengthen development efforts
- Exert leadership in creative problem solving

To successfully accomplish this mission, SANBAG will foster enhanced relationships among all of its stakeholders while adding to the value of local governments.

# **SANBAG Member Jurisdictions**

- City of Adelanto
- Town of Apple Valley
- City of Barstow
- City of Big Bear Lake
- City of Chino
- City of Chino Hills
- City of Colton
- City of Fontana
- City of Grand Terrace
- City of Hesperia
- City of Highland
- City of Loma Linda
- City of Montclair

- City of Needles
- City of Ontario
- City of Rancho Cucamonga
- City of Redlands
- City of Rialto
- City of San Bernardino
- County of San Bernardino
- City of Twentynine Palms
- City of Upland
- City of Victorville
- City of Yucaipa
- Town of Yucca Valley

# **SANBAG Board of Directors**

| <u>President</u><br>Ryan McEachron, Council Member<br><i>City of Victorville</i> | Darcy McNaboe, Mayor<br>City of Grand Terrace    | Joel Klink, Mayor<br>City of Twentynine Palms |
|--|--|---|
| <u>Vice-President</u>  | Mike Leonard, Council Member<br>City of Hesperia | Ray Musser, Mayor<br>City of Upland           |
| Robert A. Lovingood, Supervisor  | Larry McCallon, Mayor                            | Dick Riddell, Council Member                  |
| County of San Bernardino   | City of Highland                                 | City of Yucaipa                               |
| Rich Kerr, Mayor   | Rhodes "Dusty" Rigsby, Mayor                     | George Huntington, Mayor                      |
| City of Adelanto   | City of Lorna Linda                              | Town of Yucca Valley                          |
| Curt Emick, Council Member   | Paul Eaton, Mayor                                | Janice Rutherford, Supervisor                 |
| Town of Apple Valley   | City of Montclair                                | County of San Bernardino                      |
| Julie McIntyre, Mayor  | Edward Paget, Mayor                              | James Ramos, Supervisor                       |
| City of Barstow  | City of Needles                                  | County of San Bernardino                      |
| Bill Jahn, Mayor Pro Tem   | Alan Wapner, Mayor Pro Tem                       | Curt Hagman, Supervisor                       |
| City of Big Bear Lake  | City of Ontario                                  | County of San Bernardino                      |
| Dennis Yates, Mayor  | L. Dennis Michael, Mayor                         | Josie Gonzales, Supervisor                    |
| City of Chino  | City of Rancho Cucamonga                         | County of San Bernardino                      |
| Ed Graham, Council Member  | Jon Harrison, Mayor Pro Tem                      | John Bulinski, Caltrans                       |
| City of Chino Hills  | City of Redlands                                 | Ex-Officio Member                             |
| Frank Navarro, Council Member<br>City of Colton                                  | Deborah Robertson, Mayor<br>City of Rialto       | Ray Wolfe, Executive Director                 |
| Michael Tahan, Mayor Pro Tem<br>City of Fontana                                  | R. Carey Davis, Mayor<br>City of San Bernardino  | Eileen Teichert, SANBAG Counsel               |

# Table of Contents

| ES    | Executive Summary  | ES-1  |
|-------|--|-------|
| ١.    | Introduction   | I-1   |
|       | SANBAG Background  | I-1   |
|       | SANBAG Responsibilities                                  | I-1   |
|       | Measure I  | 1-3   |
|       | Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP) Development         |       |
|       | CTP Goals  | 1-5   |
|       | CTP Relationship to Countywide/Regional Planning Efforts | I-6   |
| 11.   | State of the Subregion                                   |       |
|       | Physical Environment                                     | II-2  |
|       | Environmental Setting                                    | II-3  |
|       | Demographic Environment                                  | II-4  |
|       | Highways   | II-9  |
|       | Arterial System  | II-12 |
|       | Modeling Analysis of Highway System                      | II-12 |
|       | Transit  | II-14 |
|       | Goods Movement/Freight                                   | II-21 |
|       | Freight and Air Quality                                  | II-28 |
|       | Airports   | II-30 |
|       | Active Transportation                                    | II-31 |
|       | Travel Demand Management                                 | II-36 |
| III.  | Financial Forecast                                       |       |
|       | Background   | III-1 |
|       | Baseline and Aggressive Scenario Revenue Forecasts       | III-2 |
| IV.   | Future of the Subregion                                  | IV-1  |
|       | Growth Forecasts   | IV-1  |
|       | Sustainability   | IV-5  |
|       | SANBAG's Role in Sustainability                          | IV-8  |
| V.    | Transportation Investments                               | V-1   |
|       | The Mobility Pyramid                                     | V-1   |
|       | Highway  | V-4   |
|       | Transit  | V-5   |
|       | Airports   | V-16  |
|       | Goods Movement/Freight                                   | V-16  |
|       | Active Transportation                                    | V-20  |
| VI.   | Transportation Strategy                                  | VI-1  |
|       | Overarching Principles                                   | VI-1  |
|       | CTP Key Strategic Issues                                 | VI-2  |
|       | Individual Strategies                                    | VI-3  |
|       | Looking to the Future                                    | VI-7  |
| VII.  | Acronym List   | VII-1 |
| VIII. | Appendices   | 1     |
|       | Appendix A – Baseline Scenario Project Listing           | 2     |
|       | Appendix B – Aggressive Scenario Project Listing         |       |

# List of Tables

| Table ES-1: Ten-Year Delivery Plan Projects         ES-7   |
|--|
| Table ES-2: CTP Scenarios ES-9   |
| Table ES-3: Forecast 2040 San Bernardino County Daily Performance Statistics                           |
| Table ES-4: Summary of Long-Term Transportation and Sustainability Strategies         ES-11            |
| Table II-1: San Bernardino County 2012 Population/Employment   |
| Table II-2: SBTAM County to County Person Trip Summaries         II-12                                 |
| Table II-3: SBTAM San Bernardino County Performance Statistics   |
| Table II-4: Existing San Bernardino Transit Service Provider Summary                                   |
| Table II-5: Non-Motorized Trips to Work         II-32  |
| Table II-6: City Bike Path Mileage by Class       II-35  |
| Table III-1: Estimate of Uncommitted Revenue Beyond the Ten-Year Delivery Plan                         |
| Table III-2: Ten-Year Delivery Plan Projects         III-5   |
| Table III-3: New Revenue Sources and Innovative Financing Strategies for 2012 RTP/SCS                  |
| Table IV-1: San Bernardino County Forecast Population and Employment Growth         IV-2               |
| Table IV-2: Forecast 2040 County to County Person Trip Growth         IV-10                            |
| Table IV-3: Forecast 2040 San Bernardino County Performance Statistics                                 |
| Table V-1: CTP Scenarios V-3   |
| Table V-2: Forecast 2040 San Bernardino County Baseline Scenario Performance Statistics         V-10   |
| Table V-3: Forecast 2040 San Bernardino County Aggressive Scenario Performance Statistics         V-13 |
| Table VI-1: Summary of Long-Term Transportation and Sustainability Strategies         VI-4             |

# List of Figures

| Figure ES-1: Existing and Planned Regional Rail Network                         | ES-2  |
|---|-------|
| Figure ES-2: Decline in State Gas Tax Purchasing Power E                        | ES-4  |
| Figure ES-3: San Bernardino County Forecast Population and Employment Growth E  | ES-8  |
| Figure I-1: San Bernardino County and SANBAG Subregion                          | I-2   |
| Figure I-2: SANBAG Range of Activities  |       |
| -igure II-1: San Bernardino Historic Population                                 | .11-2 |
| -igure II-2: Percentage of 2011 Greenhouse Gas Emissions in California          | .II-3 |
| -igure II-3: PM 2.5 Days above National 24-Hour Standard in Southern California | .11-4 |
| -igure II-4: San Bernardino County Existing Land Uses                           | .II-6 |
| -igure II-5: Existing Population Density  | .II-7 |
| -igure II-6: Median Household Income  | .II-8 |
| -igure II-7: Employment by Clusters with Greater than 20,000 Jobs               | .II-8 |
| -igure II-8: Existing Employment Density  | .11-9 |
| -igure II-9: San Bernardino County Freeway/Arterial System                      | I-10  |
| -igure II-10: Historical AM Peak Period PeMS DelayII                            | I-11  |
| -igure II-11: Historical PM Peak Period PeMS DelayIl                            | I-11  |
| -igure II-12: Base Year 2012 AM Peak Period Transportation System Performance   | I-13  |

| Figure II-13: | Base Year 2012 PM Peak Period Transportation System PerformanceII-14 |
|---------------|--|
| Figure II-14: | San Bernardino County Transit SystemII-16                            |
| Figure II-15: | Regional Rail NetworkII-20   |
| Figure II-16: | Weekday Railway UtilizationII-23                                     |
| Figure II-17: | Developed Industrial/Warehousing Land UseII-24                       |
| Figure II-18: | Railroad Crossing LocationsII-25                                     |
| Figure II-19: | Freeway, Rail Lines and Intermodal FacilitiesII-26                   |
| Figure II-20: | Existing San Bernardino County Daily Truck VolumesII-27              |
| Figure II-21: | San Bernardino County Air DistrictsII-28                             |
| Figure II-22: | NOx Emission Reductions Needed to Meet Federal Ozone StandardsII-29  |
| Figure II-23: | Ontario International PassengersII-30                                |
| Figure II-24: | San Bernardino County Bicycle FacilitiesII-32                        |
| Figure III-1: | Measure I Historical RevenueIII-1                                    |
| Figure III-2: | Measure I Revenue Allocation by SubareaIII-2                         |
| Figure III-3: | Decline in State Gas Tax Purchasing PowerIII-3                       |
| Figure IV-1:  | Population Growth Density IV-3                                       |
| Figure IV-2:  | Employment Growth Density IV-4                                       |
| Figure IV-3:  | San Bernardino County Person Trip Distribution IV-11                 |
| Figure IV-4:  | Daily Traffic Volume Growth 2012-2040 IV-12                          |
| Figure IV-5:  | AM Peak Period Forecast 2040 No Build Congestion IV-13               |
| Figure IV-6:  | PM Peak Period Forecast 2040 No Build Congestion IV-14               |
| Figure V-1:   | Mobility Pyramid V-1   |
| Figure V-2:   | Aggressive Scenario Projects V-4                                     |
| Figure V-3:   | Baseline Scenario Transit Projects                                   |
| Figure V-4:   | Aggressive Scenario Transit Projects V-7                             |
| Figure V-5:   | AM Peak Period Forecast 2040 Baseline Scenario Congestion V-11       |
|               | PM Peak Period Forecast 2040 Baseline Scenario Congestion V-12       |
| Figure V-7:   | AM Peak Period Forecast 2040 Aggressive Scenario Congestion V-14     |
| Figure V-8:   | PM Peak Period Forecast 2040 Aggressive Scenario Congestion V-15     |

# **ES Executive Summary**

The transportation landscape is changing. As we look back over the trends and accomplishments of the last 25 years, we see a gradual shift at the state level from a principal focus on mobility and congestion relief to a principal focus on sustainability. We see this even in the titles of key propositions and legislation. Sustainability has certainly not been ignored in prior decades, and need for congestion relief remains in the decades to come, but clearly the emphasis has shifted. This shift is a significant consideration in how San Bernardino County plans its transportation system going forward.

The purpose of this Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP) is to lay out a strategy for long term investment in and management of San Bernardino County's transportation assets. Before describing the strategy, however, it is important to understand some of the history behind these changes in emphasis to properly set the stage for a number of challenging issues that need to be addressed in the CTP.

### Transportation Funding in the Last 30 Years - A Brief History

The emphasis on mobility and congestion relief in California can be seen in legislation dating back to the mid-1980s, when the state legislature began authorizing sales taxes for transportation projects in individual counties. Under this legislation, counties and cities could cooperatively establish new "transportation authorities" to administer the tax proceeds in keeping with voter-approved expenditure programs. In 1984, voters in Santa Clara County approved the first such sales tax in California. The legislature soon gave all counties the power to adopt these taxes, prompting 17 counties, including San Bernardino County, to adopt these voter-approved taxes by 1990.

The voter-approved San Bernardino County half-cent sales tax began generating funds in April, 1990. Some of the cornerstone projects in the first Measure I Expenditure Plan included construction of the SR-71 and SR-210 freeways and initiation of service for the regional Metrolink commuter rail system in 1991. The SR-60 and I-10 freeways underwent major upgrades to 4 mixed flow lanes plus 1 High-Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lane in the West Valley, and a truck climbing lane was added on eastbound I-10 through Redlands.

At the regional level, the sales tax measures have enabled Southern California to go from virtually no passenger rail service in 1990 to over 500 miles of commuter rail and over 100 miles of heavy rail and light rail today. This has been an important element in transforming downtown Los Angeles into a much more vibrant center of activity than it was 20 years ago, with greatly increased transit connectivity region wide. **Figure ES-1** shows the current extent of the regional rail network. San Bernardino County is a vital part of this growing network.

Mobility needs were further highlighted in Proposition 111, titled The Traffic Congestion Relief and Spending Limitation Act Of 1990, passed by the voters of California in June 1990. The official proposition summary stated, in part:

"This measure would enact a statewide traffic congestion relief program and update the spending limit on state and local government to better reflect the needs of a growing California population. It would provide new revenues to be used to reduce traffic congestion by building state highways, local streets and roads, and public mass transit facilities. This measure would enact a 55% increase in truck weight fees and a five-cent-per-gallon increase in the fuel tax on August 1, 1990, and an additional one cent on January 1 of each of the next four years."



Figure ES-1: Existing and Planned Regional Rail Network

This proposition represents the last time that the State of California gas tax was increased. It also established county-level "Congestion Management Agencies," or CMAs, and required each of these entities to establish Congestion Management Programs (CMPs). SANBAG became the County CMA in 1990 and approved its first CMP in 1992.

Senate Bill 45 (Kopp - 1997) made major changes to the process by which State and federal funds are allocated to individual projects statewide, with a greater focus on local control. County Transportation Commissions such as SANBAG were given the ability to program 75 percent of these funds, with the State programming the remainder for inter-regional projects and for state highway operations and maintenance. The programming is managed regionally through the Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP), maintained by the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) through its legal designation as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO).

A 30-year extension of Measure I was passed by the voters in 2004 with an unprecedented 80 percent of the vote in favor. Much of the success of that Measure could be attributed to the continued focus on congestion relief and safety, but with a greater emphasis on fixing more localized problems, such as freeway interchanges and arterial streets. The Measure also increased the county's emphasis on transit, with commitments to initiating passenger rail service to Redlands, extension of the Gold Line to

Montclair, and improvements to Metrolink service. It also set in motion the approval of a development mitigation program that all the cities in the Valley and Victor Valley implemented through development impact fees (DIFs) for partial funding of interchanges, arterials, and rail/highway grade separations.

Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32), passed in 2006, introduced a new focus on growing California in a sustainable way. As indicated on the California Air Resources Board website, "The passage of AB 32, the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006, marked a watershed moment in California's history. By requiring in law a sharp reduction of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, California set the stage for its transition to a sustainable, low-carbon future. AB 32 was the first program in the country to take a comprehensive, long-term approach to addressing climate change, and does so in a way that aims to improve the environment and natural resources while maintaining a robust economy. AB 32 requires California to reduce its GHG emissions to 1990 levels by 2020 — a reduction of approximately 15 percent below emissions expected under a 'business as usual' scenario." Subsequent Executive Orders by Governors Schwarzenegger and Brown have stated the need for dramatic reductions of 80% in GHG emissions from the transportation sector by 2050 and 40% by 2030.

Senate Bill 375 further increased the focus on sustainability for regions as they grow, requiring that each region, including SCAG, prepare a Sustainable Communities Strategy. As part of the six-county SCAG region, SANBAG and its local jurisdictions were partners with SCAG in crafting the first SCS, incorporated into the 2012-2035 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy or RTP/SCS.

SANBAG is also a partner with two Air Quality Management Districts (South Coast and Mojave Desert) to attain air quality standards set by the Environmental Protection Agency. Both air basins are designated as non-attainment and the South Coast air basin is designated an "extreme" non-attainment area. Although tremendous progress has been made in cleaning the air over the last several decades, the South Coast air basin is still well short of what is needed to attain federal ozone standards by 2023 and a subsequent stricter attainment goal by 2032. This is of concern to San Bernardino County, because the path to attainment falls heavily on the transportation sector.

The County of San Bernardino and SANBAG adopted the Countywide Vision in 2011, setting in motion initiatives spanning across 10 Vision elements as described later in the CTP: Education, Environment, Housing, Image, Infrastructure, Jobs/Economy, Public Safety, Quality of Life, Water, and Wellness. This has established San Bernardino County as a sustainability leader in the region and helps guide county and city agencies in establishing and attaining sustainability goals.

### Framing the Issues

With the above as context, what types of issues will SANBAG and our partner agencies face over the horizon of this Countywide Transportation Plan, through 2040? This section highlights several of the core transportation-related issues that will need to be addressed as we move forward. These are not the only ones, but represent key areas where SANBAG should consider taking action or advocating positions.

1. **Transportation funding** – It is well known that State and federal funding levels are not keeping up with operations and maintenance needs and requirements for new or expanded infrastructure. **Figure ES-2** presents the decline in purchasing power of the state gas tax in cents per gallon. In the meantime, the population of the Inland Empire increased 63% in the 20 years from 1990 to 2010, a growth rate of 2.5% per year. Local funds now represent over 50% of transportation infrastructure revenue in San Bernardino County.

2. Congestion relief and economic competitiveness - Although the statewide emphasis has shifted to sustainability, the need for congestion relief cannot be ignored. We live in a globally competitive environment, in which the speed and cost of doing business still matters a great deal. It is essential that San Bernardino County maintain the transportation advantages that we currently enjoy with our robust freeway and interchange network to support the logistics industry. Some 20% of our jobs are now related to logistics, and logistics



Source: Caltrans

hubs will continue to play a major role in bringing business and employment to our area.

- 3. System preservation and operations The tens of billions of dollars in street and highway infrastructure investment must be preserved. Although Caltrans and local jurisdictions are the owners and operators of our freeways and arterial streets, SANBAG can be a partner with them to ensure that these roadways and freeways are maintained and that the operations are optimized. The arterial system is dependent upon the freeway system and vice versa, therefore, routine maintenance of the entire transportation system can avoid the much larger expenditures that will be incurred from neglect. Likewise, the need for operating funds for transit is a major emerging issue and will limit transit network expansion if it is not addressed. Real-time information and technology both play a key role in maximizing system operations and efficiency.
- 4. Land use SANBAG and local jurisdictions are aggressively promoting transit oriented development (TOD) as part of a strategy for economic growth and for achieving the regional SB 375 targets. An example is the study for the ARRIVE Corridor along the San Bernardino Metrolink line, which is exploring achievable strategies for TOD for each of the six stations along this line in San Bernardino County. The challenge with TOD in San Bernardino County has to do with market readiness. Jurisdictions cannot impose development types and densities that the market cannot yet afford. The strategy must be one of preparing for TOD, while



also being patient and demonstrating commitment to rail/transit infrastructure that will attract TOD developers. Most jurisdictions with rail station assets are ready to support TOD, and some have had recent success, but they may need assistance with infrastructure investment, which was dealt a serious blow with the State's dissolution of redevelopment agencies.

5. **Transit system interconnectivity** – The transit network is growing, both regionally and in the Inland Empire and in terms of both rail and bus. Improved coordination is needed across transit

Figure ES-2: Decline in State Gas Tax Purchasing Power

Executive Summary **2015** 

(rail, fixed route bus, and demand responsive) and ridesharing modes (carpool and vanpool) to provide a high level of customer service at an affordable cost. The telecommunications industry reminds us that successful communications is all about the network. The same is true in building the transit and ridesharing system, and we need to think in terms of interconnectivity, not independent systems.

6. Attainment of air quality standards – Ozone attainment in the South Coast Air Basin is at a critical juncture. As the Basin gets closer to background ozone concentrations (estimated by SCAQMD at 48 ppb), the path to attainment will require adoption of technologies and fleet turnover rates that are acknowledged by many as not feasible within the timelines prescribed by EPA. We need to push forward on air quality improvements, but at a rate that our local economy and industry can absorb, based on technologies that can be cost-effectively incorporated into the marketplace. A balanced approach is needed.

### **CTP Key Issues**

- Transportation funding
- Congestion relief and economic competitiveness
- System preservation and operations
- Land use
- Transit system interconnectivity
- Attainment of air quality standards
- Sustainability and GHG reduction
- 7. Sustainability and GHG reduction SANBAG and our local agency partners have been leaders in regional

planning for GHG reduction. The lofty goals of AB 32 and GHG-related Executive Orders now need to be translated into an approach that can achieve those goals without damaging the economy or our region's competitiveness. Recent analysis in the California Transportation Plan has indicated that land use change and expansion of transit services will produce a relatively small portion of the GHG reductions needed. The analysis indicated that radical transformation in vehicle and fuels technology will need to be the primary mechanism to produce the 80% reduction in GHGs from the transportation fleet targeted for 2050 and 40% by 2030. As with attainment for criteria pollutants, GHG reductions need to be approached in a balanced way.

### **CTP Goals and Objectives**

The CTP is San Bernardino County's long-term plan for transportation. It is focused on several overarching goals that build on the SANBAG Mission Statement. The goals of the CTP are to:

- Improve safety and mobility for all modes of travel in San Bernardino County by residents, businesses, employees, students and visitors.
- Integrate countywide transportation plans and initiatives, to better serve the needs of the county, and to coordinate transportation systems with other counties through the Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy.
- Plan and deliver transportation projects and services in a manner that promotes the County's economic competitiveness, affordable housing, environmental quality, overall sustainability, and access by the full spectrum of system users.
- Promote stewardship of the public resources entrusted to SANBAG and other transportation agencies in the County through analysis and application of the most cost-effective approaches to delivering transportation projects and programs.
- Promote the funding of transportation needs through collaboration with local, state, federal, and private stakeholders.
- Support state, regional, and local environmental and sustainability goals.

The CTP goals are supported by an underlying set of objectives which represent the measureable means to achieve the goals. Objectives include:

- Reduce travel times for both highway and transit travel
- Maximize the efficiency and reliability of the transportation system
- Reduce vehicle hours traveled
- Reduce vehicle emissions, both criteria pollutants and GHG emissions
- Increase the share of people carpooling, bicycling, walking and taking transit
- Reduce collision rates
- Preserve existing infrastructure in a cost-effective manner
- Encourage development around existing and planned transit stations and hubs

### The CTP and Its Relationship to Other Plans

The CTP needs to be understood in the context of several other plans and programs managed by SANBAG.

- The Measure I 2010-2040 Ordinance and Expenditure Plan extended the half-cent sales tax for transportation for an additional 30 years to 2040. The Expenditure Plan identifies how the Measure I revenue is to be allocated by subarea and program. The Expenditure Plan is provided in Appendix A of the Measure I Strategic Plan at http://www.sanbag.ca.gov/planning2/plan\_measure-i.html.
- The Measure I 2010-2040 Strategic Plan, approved by the SANBAG Board in April 2009, specifies the policies by which the funds are to be managed. It also provides an overall funding and management strategy for Measure I. The Plan can be reviewed at the link above.
- The Measure I Strategic Plan required the development of a Ten-Year Delivery Plan. The purpose of the Delivery Plan is to define the scope, schedule and budget for projects to be developed and delivered in the early years of Measure I 2010-2040. The Delivery Plan was first approved by the Board in early 2012 and was updated in early 2014. The Delivery Plan can be found under Publications at the SANBAG home page at http://www.sanbag.ca.gov/. Table ES-1 presents the projects included in the Delivery Plan.
- The Development Mitigation Nexus Study, approved by the SANBAG Board in 2005, identifies funding forecast to be generated from new development over the course of Measure I 2010-2040. These funds, generated primarily from transportation fees on new development, are used as part of the funding package for three types of projects in the Valley and Victor Valley: freeway interchanges, arterials, and rail/highway grade separations. The Nexus Study identifies the shares of funding for which local jurisdictions are responsible. The Nexus Study (Appendix K of the CMP) can be accessed at http://www.sanbag.ca.gov/planning2/congestion-mgmt.html.
- The Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) is a short-term listing of all transportation projects proposed over a six-year period for the SCAG region. SANBAG submits the San Bernardino County portion of the FTIP to SCAG, with major updates scheduled every even year. See the link to the FTIP at http://ftip.scag.ca.gov/Pages/2015/adopted.aspx.
- The Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy is prepared by SCAG every four years, with substantial input from County Transportation Commissions and local governments. The San Bernardino CTP is one of the primary sources of input to the RTP/SCS. The current RTP/SCS was prepared for the 2012-2035 timeframe. An update for 2016 through

Executive Summary **2015** 

2040 is scheduled for adoption by SCAG in April 2016. See http://rtpscs.scag.ca.gov/Pages/default.aspx.

| Table ES-1: Ten-Year Delivery Plan Projects                           |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| Measure I Programs  |  |  |  |
| Cajon Pass Subarea Program  |  |  |  |
| I-15/I-215 (Devore) Interchange                                       |  |  |  |
| San Bernardino Valley Freeway Program                                 |  |  |  |
| I-10 Widening (HOV or Express Lanes) from L                           | A County Line to Ford Street                                       |  |  |
| I-15 Express Lanes from Riverside County Lin                          | e to I-215   |  |  |
| I-215 Widening from Riverside County Line to                          | o I-10   |  |  |
| I-10 Truck Climbing Lane from Live Oak to Riv                         | verside County Line  |  |  |
| SR-210 Widening from Highland Avenue to I-                            | 10   |  |  |
| San Bernardino Valley Freeway Interchange Pro                         | gram   |  |  |
| I-10/Cherry Avenue  | I-10/Alabama Street  |  |  |
| I-10/Citrus Avenue  | I-15/Baseline Road   |  |  |
| I-10/Tippecanoe Avenue Phase 1 & 2                                    | I-10/Mount Vernon Avenue   |  |  |
| I-10/Cedar Avenue   | SR-60/Archibald Avenue   |  |  |
| SR-210/Baseline Road  | I-10/Monte Vista Avenue  |  |  |
| SR-60/Central Avenue  | I-10/Pepper Avenue Phase 2   |  |  |
| I-10/University Avenue  | I-10/Riverside Avenue Phase 2                                      |  |  |
| I-215/University Parkway  |  |  |  |
| San Bernardino Valley Major Street Program                            |  |  |  |
| North Vineyard Avenue Grade Separation (U                             | nion Pacific)  |  |  |
| South Milliken Avenue Grade Separation (Un                            | ion Pacific)   |  |  |
| Glen Helen Parkway Grade Separation (Burlin                           | Glen Helen Parkway Grade Separation (Burlington Northern-Santa Fe) |  |  |
| Palm Avenue Grade Separation (Burlington Northern-Santa Fe)           |  |  |  |
| Laurel Avenue Grade Separation (Burlington Northern-Santa Fe)         |  |  |  |
| San Bernardino Valley Metrolink/Passenger Rail Program                |  |  |  |
| Downtown San Bernardino Rail  |  |  |  |
| Redlands Passenger Rail   |  |  |  |
| San Bernardino Line Double Track (Prelimina                           | ry Engineering)  |  |  |
| Gold Line to Montclair (Environmental Docur                           | mentation/Preliminary Engineering)                                 |  |  |
| Valley Express Bus & Bus Rapid Transit Program                        | 1  |  |  |
| E Street Bus Rapid Transit  |  |  |  |
| Victor Valley Major Local Highway Program                             |  |  |  |
| Yucca Loma Corridor – Yucca Loma Bridge and Yates Road                |  |  |  |
| I-15/Ranchero Road Interchange  |  |  |  |
| Yucca Loma Corridor – Green Tree Boulevard Extension                  |  |  |  |
| US-395 Widening from SR-18 to Chamberlaine Way                        |  |  |  |
| Ranchero Road Corridor  |  |  |  |
| North Desert Major Local Highway Program                              |  |  |  |
| Lenwood Road Grade Separation   |  |  |  |
| Source: SANBAG Measure I 2010-2040 Ten-Year Delivery Plan. March 2014 |  |  |  |

Source: SANBAG Measure I 2010-2040 Ten-Year Delivery Plan, March 2014

### Summary of the CTP Analysis of Future Transportation Needs and Funding

San Bernardino County is home to a world class network of freeways, arterials, freight rail lines, airports, and transit routes. This network, together with our proximity to the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach, is one of the primary reasons that the County has become a strategic location for logistics. However, this network must be maintained and built upon to satisfy the needs of both existing operations and future growth.

As indicated in **Figure ES-3** significant growth is anticipated in San Bernardino County through 2040. Annualized growth rates from 2012 to 2040 are 1.0 percent for population and 1.6 percent for employment, or total growth rates of 32 percent and 56 percent, respectively, over the full 28-year period.

Approximately \$5.4 billion (in 2015 dollars) is forecast to be collected through the life of Measure I 2010-2040

The CTP tested two scenarios based on different levels of transportation service and forecast funding. The Baseline Scenario includes projects that can be funded with traditionally available local, Measure I, State, and federal revenue sources through 2040. The Aggressive Scenario is a needs-based scenario assuming additional sources of revenue. However, the Aggressive Scenario is also consistent with the RTP/SCS "financially constrained" plan. This includes SCAG's "innovative revenue sources" contained in the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS, a substantial increase over traditionally available funding streams. This CTP does not recommend one scenario over the other, but delineates both to illustrate the transportation projects that could be implemented and maintained in each case.





The Aggressive Scenario includes all projects in the Baseline Scenario plus the additional projects listed. The funding assumptions include some of the major "innovative sources" included in the SCAG RTP/SCS. The Aggressive Scenario excludes certain projects that are included in the SCAG RTP/SCS that are regional in nature, such as the SCAG dedicated truck lanes on SR-60. **Table ES-2** presents a summary of the projects included in the Baseline and Aggressive Scenarios. The Baseline Scenario includes projects contained in the 10-Year Delivery Plan plus those additional projects viewed to be affordable in the forecast of traditionally available funding levels. The funding assumptions are listed on the right side of the table.

### Table ES-2: CTP Scenarios

|               |            | Projects  | Funding   |
|---------------|------------|---|---|
|               | Baseline   | <ul> <li>10-Year Delivery Plan Plus Constrained Projects through<br/>2040:</li> <li>Freeway/Interchange Program (10-YDP Projects only)</li> <li>I-15 Express Lanes to US-395</li> <li>I-215 North HOV lane (SR-210 to I-15)</li> <li>Valley Interchange Phasing Program (constrained to<br/>revenue) or Priority 11-18 interchanges (note that<br/>priorities are being re-evaluated in 2015)</li> <li>Arterial Program (constrained to revenue)</li> <li>No additional grade separations</li> <li>Redlands Passenger Rail Project</li> <li>Gold Line to Montclair</li> <li>Metrolink double track (CP Lilac to CP Rancho)</li> <li>Metrolink expansion (50 daily trains)</li> <li>Active Transportation Projects supportable by grants and<br/>Transportation Development Act funds</li> <li>West Valley Connector Express Bus</li> </ul>  | <ul> <li>Core Revenues, Financially Constrained<br/>Traditional sources:</li> <li>Measure I Forecast revenue in 10-YDP</li> <li>State revenues constrained to gas tax<br/>collections</li> <li>Federal revenues constrained to gas<br/>tax collections</li> <li>Tolls for express lane scenario</li> <li>Transit revenue adequate to cover<br/>current operations held at 3%</li> <li>Mitigation fees</li> </ul>  |
| CTP Scenarios | Aggressive | <ul> <li>Foothill/5<sup>th</sup> Express Bus</li> <li>Baseline Projects Plus the Following:         <ul> <li>Freeway Improvements</li> <li>Full Buildout of I-215 from I-10 to SR-60 (including I-215/Washington-Mt Vernon interchange)</li> <li>I-215 mixed flow lane from SR-210 to I-15</li> <li>Completion of I-10 to Riverside Co. Line with HOV or Express Lanes</li> <li>SR-210 HOV lane from I-215 to I-10</li> <li>I-15 Express Lanes from US-395 to High Desert Corridor</li> <li>I-10/I-15 Express Lane Connectors</li> </ul> </li> <li>Interchange Program Buildout</li> <li>Arterial Program Buildout</li> <li>All Nexus Study Grade Separations</li> <li>Additional Alameda Corridor East Grade Separations</li> <li>Additional Metrolink double track segments</li> <li>BRT (West Valley Connector, Foothill-5th)</li> <li>Express Bus (Remaining key transit corridors)</li> <li>Non-Motorized Transportation Plan buildout (Secondary Active Transportation Projects)</li> <li>Goods movement projects (truck climbing lanes, Intermodal access improvements)</li> <li>East-West Freight Corridor (regional project)</li> <li>High Desert Corridor (public and/or private funding)</li> <li>Passenger Rail to Ontario Airport</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Match Funding to Infrastructure Need<br/>Potential options:</li> <li>Tolls for express lane scenario</li> <li>Supplemental Measure I</li> <li>State and Federal gas taxes indexed to<br/>be on par with current authorizations<br/>with inflation</li> <li>Regional/State/Federal VMT fee (or<br/>equivalent)</li> <li>Aggressive assumptions for State<br/>Bonds/Federal Stimulus</li> <li>Prop 1B-type infusion every 10 years</li> <li>Federal freight dollars</li> </ul> |

The performance of the transportation system is presented in **Table ES-3**. This analysis was generated using the San Bernardino Transportation Analysis Model (SBTAM), which is a focused sub-model derived from the SCAG regional model. SBTAM includes the same network as in the 6-county SCAG region, but with additional detail in San Bernardino County. The results show a substantial reduction in vehicle hours of travel and savings in delay within San Bernardino County for the Baseline Scenario. A savings of 100,000 vehicle hours per weekday would equate to over \$400 million in delay savings per year, based on the value of time alone (typically in the range of \$15 per hour).

| Measure of Effectiveness | 2012       | 2040 No<br>Build | 2040<br>Baseline | Percent<br>Change from<br>2040 No Build | 2040<br>Aggressive | Percent<br>Change from<br>2040 No Build |
|--------------------------|------------|------------------|------------------|---|--------------------|---|
| Vehicle Miles Traveled   | 56,462,829 | 81,122,010       | 82,662,578       | 1.9%                                    | 82,945,126         | 2.2%                                    |
| Vehicle Hours Traveled   | 1,203,423  | 2,029,243        | 1,907,230        | -6.0%                                   | 1,886,904          | -7.0%                                   |
| Vehicle Hours of Delay   | 140,982    | 476,229          | 349,896          | -26.5%                                  | 274,436            | -42.4%                                  |
| Average Speed (mph)      | 46.9       | 40.0             | 43.3             | 8.4%                                    | 44.0               | 9.9%                                    |

### Table ES-3: Forecast 2040 San Bernardino County Daily Performance Statistics

Source: SBTAM

### Summary of the CTP Transportation Strategy

There are two parts to SANBAG's transportation strategy: a set of overarching principles, coupled with individual strategies by geographic area, mode, and function.

### **Overarching Principles**

- **Customer focus** SANBAG and other public agencies exist to serve their traveling "customers." Customers extend across all auto, transit, truck, and non-motorized modes.
- Partnership-building SANBAG is part of a multi-agency team to deliver mobility and safety improvements to our customers. Other important parts of the team include Caltrans, transit agencies, local jurisdictions, SCAG, air quality management districts, and the private sector. Good communication and collaboration is essential for each agency to accomplish its part of the overall mission.
- **Stewardship** The public has entrusted resources to SANBAG and other transportation-related agencies. We must be good stewards of both the limited financial resources available and the environmental resources we need to preserve as the system is built.
- **Cost-effectiveness** Investments should be made in a way that maximizes the benefits derived from the available resources, with due attention given to geographic equity.
- **Economic competitiveness** The transportation system exists to enable the businesses and residents of San Bernardino County to thrive. Our continued investment in transportation efficiency will enhance San Bernardino County as a business location.
- Delivering on commitments Commitments are made at multiple levels, but major ones include: delivering the range of projects reflected in the Measure I Expenditure Plan; equitably distributing State, federal, and Measure I funding to the county's transit agencies and local jurisdictions; supporting implementation of the San Bernardino Countywide Vision; fulfilling commitments in the Sustainability MOU with SCAG; and supporting other statewide sustainability goals while fostering economic growth.
- System preservation SANBAG and its agency partners need to work together to estimate maintenance needs and seek the funding needed to preserve/operate capital investment in highways and transit systems.

### Individual Strategies

Individual strategies can be grouped into three primary categories:

- Geographic
- Modal
- Functional

**Table ES-4** presents proposed SANBAG strategies for the modal, functional and geographic categories incorporated into the Strategic Plan. Modal categories have been nested into the primary geographic subareas of the Measure I Strategic Plan. The primary challenge or challenges associated with each component are identified, along with corresponding strategies that address the challenges.

| Category                             | Challenge   | Strategy  |  |  |  |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|--|--|--|
| Valley Categories k                  | Valley Categories by Mode   |   |  |  |  |
| Freeway system                       | Forecasts show that the system will be<br>highly congested by 2040. Funding for<br>capacity and operational<br>enhancements to the system is<br>expected to be constrained.   | Position the freeway system to adapt to future<br>demands by using a managed lane approach and<br>improved traffic management and information<br>systems across all freeways.   |  |  |  |
| Freeway<br>interchanges              | Projected Measure I, state, and federal<br>funds will be insufficient to meet all<br>the interchange improvement needs.   | Spread Measure I funds across interchange hot-<br>spots using both a phased approach and right-sizing<br>of full interchange improvements. Look to a future<br>Measure I, state, and federal funds to complete the<br>freeway interchange program.  |  |  |  |
| Rail/highway<br>grade<br>separations | Projected Measure I, state, and federal<br>funds will be insufficient to build all<br>the grade separations identified.   | Prioritize additional grade separations and proceed<br>with project development on at least two projects,<br>to take advantage of potential future freight funding<br>opportunities.  |  |  |  |
| Arterials                            | Arterial project construction has lagged original expectations.   | Encourage jurisdictions to accelerate arterial<br>improvement projects and continue policy flexibility<br>for funding development shares. SANBAG will<br>identify arterial improvements that are particularly<br>important to route continuity.   |  |  |  |
| Passenger Rail                       | Stations along the Metrolink San<br>Bernardino Line and the Redlands Rail<br>corridor are our most significant<br>opportunities for transit oriented<br>development and transit-related<br>economic growth. Funds for rail<br>services are limited, and Metrolink<br>costs are increasing faster than<br>available funding. | To encourage investment, jurisdictions along these<br>corridors need assurances from SANBAG/Metrolink<br>that service can be maintained and, ideally,<br>expanded. Develop a sustainable funding plan, and<br>integrate operations for these corridors wherever<br>possible. Position Metrolink capacity-enhancement<br>projects for future implementation funding. |  |  |  |
| Gold Line                            | Timing of extension of Gold Line to<br>Montclair and beyond is uncertain, and<br>issue of overlapping Metrolink/Gold<br>Line/ONT corridors needs to be<br>resolved.   | Develop an integrated operational/funding solution<br>for Gold Line and Metrolink in coordination with LA<br>Metro, Metrolink, and local jurisdictions.   |  |  |  |

Table ES-4: Summary of Long-Term Transportation and Sustainability Strategies

| Category   | Challenge   | Strategy   |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|--|
|  | y Mode, Continued   |  |  |  |
| Transit<br>Connection to<br>ONT                  | The City of Ontario is negotiating for<br>the transfer of control of Ontario<br>International Airport to the City. The<br>region would benefit from improved<br>transit access for passengers and<br>employees.   | Take a phased approach to transit access to ONT,<br>beginning with shuttle service from the Metrolink<br>Rancho Cucamonga station, with a possible longer<br>term solution emerging from corridor-level analysis.  |  |  |
| Bus Rapid Transit<br>(BRT)                       | The cost of building all the BRT<br>corridors in the Long Range Transit<br>Plan far exceeds available funding. The<br>proper technology solution to carry<br>across future express bus/BRT<br>corridors also needs to be resolved.  | Reevaluate the Express Bus/BRT strategic plan, to<br>determine how premium transit should be staged<br>and funded across the Valley. The plan should<br>address corridor priorities, phasing, technology,<br>and funding options, providing information for the<br>Board to decide on the appropriate BRT/Arterial<br>funding split by 2020. |  |  |
| Fixed-route bus<br>service                       | Sustainable funding for operations is the biggest challenge.  | Study the challenges of the trajectory of transit operations funding, and jointly develop solutions between SANBAG and Omnitrans.  |  |  |
| Airports   | Passenger service has declined<br>significantly at ONT over the past<br>decade, attributed in part to current<br>management policies.   | Support Ontario and the region in the effort to regain local control of ONT, and make ONT, SBIA, and SCLA more competitive as destinations for passengers and freight.   |  |  |
| Active<br>Transportation                         | Large funding needs for building out the cycling/walking network  | <ul> <li>Continue to submit competitive grant applications<br/>to support implementation of the Non-motorized<br/>Transportation Plan (NMTP).</li> <li>Maintain and update the NMTP</li> <li>Identify and pursue grant funding opportunities<br/>to expand cycling and walking infrastructure</li> </ul>                                     |  |  |
| Demand-<br>responsive bus<br>service             | Demand-responsive service is the<br>highest cost form of transit, but<br>important in serving certain senior and<br>disabled transit riders. Under the<br>Americans with Disabilities Act, transit<br>operators are required to provide<br>paratransit service within ¾-mile of<br>fixed routes for passengers with<br>disabilities who cannot ride fixed-route<br>service. | Continue assistance programs, such as helping<br>demand-responsive riders use fixed-route systems<br>and coordination with non-profit entities while also<br>maintaining demand-responsive service.  |  |  |
| Transit<br>integration and<br>inter-connectivity | Transit services could be better<br>coordinated across systems in terms of<br>ease of transfers, fare media, and<br>first/last mile connections. This will be<br>even more important as the system<br>grows.  | Take a more integrated, customer-focused<br>approach to the provision of transit services.<br>Facilitate seamless ticketing and better connection<br>at existing transit centers and connection points.  |  |  |
| Mountain/Desert Strategies                       |   |  |  |  |
| Victor Valley<br>highway projects                | Growth forecasts show a near doubling in traffic volume by 2040.  | Prioritize projects that will provide the most cost-<br>effective congestion reduction benefit, designating<br>projects for Major Local Highway funding through<br>the subarea process. Continue to advocate the High<br>Desert Corridor as a P3 project.  |  |  |

### Table ES-4: Summary of Long-Term Transportation and Sustainability Strategies, Continued

| Category  | Challenge   | Strategy  |
|---|---|---|
|   | trategies, Continued  | Strategy  |
| Mountain/Desert   | Funds are limited for route expansion   | Study the challenges of the trajectory of transit   |
| fixed route transit                                     | and adjustment as the Victor Valley grows.  | operations funding, and jointly develop solutions<br>between SANBAG and the Mountain/Desert transit<br>agencies.  |
| Mountain/Desert<br>demand-<br>responsive bus<br>service | Demand-responsive service is the<br>highest cost form of transit, but<br>important in serving certain senior and<br>disabled transit riders.  | Continue assistance programs, such as helping<br>demand-responsive riders use fixed-route systems<br>and coordination with non-profit entities while also<br>maintaining demand-responsive service.   |
| Mountain<br>Subarea                                     | Though baseline population is small,<br>major congestion occurs on weekends,<br>particularly winter weekends, limiting<br>economic growth.  | Conduct a study of bottleneck locations and lower-<br>cost improvements that could reduce weekend<br>congestion levels and prioritize funding for those<br>projects.  |
| Morongo Basin   | The Basin is steadily growing, and SR-<br>62 is the only viable transportation<br>route through Yucca Valley and<br>Twentynine Palms.   | Implement improvement projects identified through the Morongo Basin Area Transportation Study (MBATS).  |
| North Desert  | The North Desert has major highway needs, but limited funding.  | Evaluate long-term priorities for project investments in the subarea.   |
| Colorado River  | Funds are extremely limited for improvements in this subarea.   | Smaller-scale, affordable improvements should be investigated and prioritized by the subarea.   |
| Functional Categori                                     | ies   |   |
| Highway<br>Maintenance<br>and Operations                | Highways are facing serious future<br>maintenance funding shortfalls. Local<br>jurisdictions are responsible for<br>arterial maintenance while Caltrans is<br>responsible for freeway and state<br>highway maintenance.                                   | Conduct a strategic planning study with Caltrans and regional agencies to assess maintenance/operations funding needs and approaches to managing costs.   |
| Rural Highway<br>Needs                                  | Rural areas require unique<br>maintenance/safety/funding<br>consideration.  | Focus on cost effective maintenance and support for<br>funding streams that the County and Caltrans can<br>utilize to maintain these rural highways.  |
| Transit System<br>Maintenance<br>and Operations         | Existing transit systems are facing potentially serious future operations funding shortfalls.   | Optimize transit operations and identify mechanisms to fund future system operations and expansion.   |
| Air Quality   | Although air quality has dramatically<br>improved over the last several<br>decades, attainment of the next set of<br>ozone standards will be extraordinarily<br>challenging and costly.   | Work with regional and state agencies and the<br>private sector to meet attainment standards on an<br>achievable timeline that does not adversely impact<br>the economy. Advocate for state/federal investment<br>that facilitates this progress. Focus on market-based<br>mobile source technology improvements and fleet<br>turnover as a win-win approach. |
| Sustainable<br>Growth                                   | The state's GHG reduction goal of 80%<br>by 2050 is an enormous challenge. If<br>not done carefully, it may undermine<br>the economy to the point where it will<br>be impossible to afford the technology<br>improvements needed to achieve this<br>goal. | Assist state/regional agencies and the private sector<br>in technology research and implementation<br>strategies that are technologically feasible and cost-<br>effective (per AB 32) for San Bernardino County.<br>Implementation should follow the natural course of<br>vehicle life cycles and fleet turnover, to the extent<br>possible.                  |

### Table ES-4: Summary of Long-Term Transportation and Sustainability Strategies, Continued

| Category                  | Challenge  | Strategy  |  |  |  |
|---------------------------|--|---|--|--|--|
| Functional Catego         | Functional Categories, Continued   |   |  |  |  |
| Habitat<br>Conservation   | Habitat conservation currently occurs<br>on a project-by-project basis, generally<br>without a comprehensive approach.   | Continue with development of the Habitat<br>Preservation/Conservation Framework as a win-win<br>approach for selected geographic areas.   |  |  |  |
| Freight                   | Forecasts show freight volume<br>through the ports tripling by 2040,<br>placing extreme demands on the<br>transportation system.   | Continue building out the freeway system,<br>interchanges, and grade separations. Work closely<br>with the private sector to understand changes in<br>technology and freight operations and how the<br>transportation system can best accommodate those<br>changes. Construct all the freight projects in the<br>California Freight Mobility Plan, to the extent<br>funding allows. |  |  |  |
| Health                    | Public health is being integrated into<br>policy frameworks throughout state,<br>regional, and local governments. The<br>challenge in the transportation arena is<br>to determine how to incorporate<br>health considerations into decision-<br>making frameworks. | Continue to build on health partnerships already<br>established. Continue focus on transit mobility and<br>developing the active transportation network to<br>promote cycling and walking.  |  |  |  |
| Transportation<br>revenue | The federal Highway Trust Fund and<br>state gasoline/diesel taxes continue to<br>lose purchasing power, resulting in<br>lower revenues for transportation<br>agencies and local jurisdictions.   | Provide input to regional and statewide discussions<br>and pilot projects on the generation of additional<br>revenue for transportation. Construct a set of<br>revenue generation options that can be evaluated<br>by the SANBAG Board, with input from a wide range<br>of stakeholders.  |  |  |  |

### Table ES-4: Summary of Long-Term Transportation and Sustainability Strategies, Continued

The CTP is a living document that will be updated in concert with future RTP/SCS updates. Future versions of the CTP will monitor the performance of the various strategies and refine the financial outlook, projects lists and future actions necessary to ensure safe and efficient of people and goods throughout San Bernardino County.

# I. Introduction

# SANBAG Background

San Bernardino Associated Governments (SANBAG) is the Council of Governments (COG) and transportation planning agency for San Bernardino County. SANBAG is responsible for cooperative regional planning and furthering an efficient multi-modal transportation system countywide. As the County Transportation Commission (CTC), County Transportation Authority (CTA), Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies (SAFE) and Congestion Management Agency (CMA), SANBAG supports freeway construction projects, regional and local San Bernardino is a diverse county that encompasses approximately 20,000 square miles with approximately 2.09 million residents

road improvements, train and bus transportation, railroad crossings, call boxes, ridesharing, congestion management efforts, active transportation efforts, and long-term planning studies. SANBAG also administers Measure I, the half-cent transportation sales tax approved by county voters in 1989.

Since its creation in 1973, SANBAG has performed transportation and regional planning services within

the largest county in the contiguous United States. San Bernardino is a diverse county that encompasses approximately 20,000 square miles with approximately 2.09 million residents. Refer to **Figure I-1** for the geographic coverage of San Bernardino County, which is also the subregion for which SANBAG has responsibility.

## **SANBAG Responsibilities**

SANBAG was formed in 1973 by joint powers agreement of the cities and the County of San Bernardino. SANBAG is governed by a Board of Directors consisting of a mayor or designated council member from each of the twenty-four cities in San Bernardino County and the five members of the San Bernardino County Board of Supervisors.

In addition to SANBAG, the composition of the SANBAG Board of Directors also serves as the governing board for the separate legal entities listed earlier.

- The San Bernardino County Transportation Commission (CTC) is responsible for short and long range transportation planning within San Bernardino County, including coordination and funding of public mass transit service, approval of capital development projects for public transit and highway projects, and identification of staging and scheduling of project development and construction relative for transportation projects in the Transportation Improvement Program.
- The San Bernardino County Transportation Authority is responsible for administration of the voter-approved half-cent transportation transactions and use tax levied in the County of San Bernardino.

- The Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies is responsible for the administration and operation of a motorist aid system of call boxes on State freeways and highways within San Bernardino County.
- The Congestion Management Agency analyzes the performance level of the regional transportation system in a manner which ensures consideration of the impacts from new development and promotes air quality through implementation of strategies in the adopted air quality plans.

As a Subregional Planning Agency, SANBAG represents the San Bernardino County subregion and assists the Southern California Association of Governments (SCAG) in carrying out its functions as the metropolitan planning organization (MPO). SANBAG performs studies and develops consensus relative to regional growth forecasts, regional transportation plans, and mobile source components of the air quality plans.



Figure I-1: San Bernardino County and SANBAG Subregion

### Figure I-2: SANBAG Range of Activities

### Freeways

- Expand freeway capacity
- Maximize efficiency of freeway system
- Provide freeway service patrol
- Maintain call box system

### Roads

- Provide funding for local jurisdictions to improve local arterials and roads, including signal coordination
- Maintain the continuity of the Nexus Study arterial network
- Identify and support safety programs to infrastructure such as roadway/rail grade separation projects

### Transit

- Support Metrolink
- Support fixed route bus service
- Support van pools

### Transportation Demand Management/ Non-Motorized Transportation

- Implement rideshare and other demand management services
- Provide funding for local jurisdictions to implement and expand bicycle facilities and infrastructure

### Sustainability

- Administer Property Assessed Clean Energy HERO Program
- Prepare growth forecasts
- Maintain 511 Motorist Aid Traveler Information System
- Manage park and ride lots
- Support alternative fuel and air quality improvement programs

# **Measure I**

In 1989, San Bernardino County voters approved a half-cent transportation sales tax to provide funding for much-needed transportation infrastructure. Upon sunset of Measure I 1990-2010, the sales tax had generated \$1.8 billion for transportation infrastructure projects throughout the County.

The success of Measure I led in 2004 to its extension by voters through 2040. The Measure I 2010-2040 Strategic Plan was approved by the SANBAG Board on April 1, 2009 as the official guide and reference for the allocation and administration of the combination of Measure I funds, State and federal transportation revenues, and private fair-share contributions to regional transportation facilities from new development.

The success of the initial sales tax measure led to the extension by voters of the sales tax measure in 2004 through 2040 Ultimately, growth in Measure I revenue is dependent on a strong economy. The Strategic Plan covers the horizon period of the long-range CTP. The Strategic Plan contains a set of overarching principles to guide

implementation. These principles included:

- 1. Deliver all Expenditure Plan projects at the earliest possible date.
- 2. Seek additional and supplemental funds as needed for completion of all Expenditure Plan projects.
- 3. Maximize leveraging of State, federal, local, and private dollars.
- 4. Ensure use of federal funds on otherwise federalized projects.
- 5. Sequence projects to maximize benefit, minimize impact to the traveling public, and support efficient delivery.
- 6. Provide for geographic equity over the life of the Measure.
- Recognize that initiation of project development work on arterial, most interchange, and railroad crossing projects is the responsibility of local jurisdictions. Initiation of project development work on freeway mainline projects and interchange improvements required for the mainline projects is the responsibility of SANBAG.
- 8. Work proactively with agency partners to minimize the time and cost of project delivery.
- 9. Structure SANBAG to effectively deliver the Measure projects.
- 10. Exercise environmental stewardship in delivering the Measure projects.
- 11. Periodically update the Strategic Plan through the life of the Measure.
- 12. Utilize debt financing when and where appropriate.

## **Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP) Development**

SANBAG serves as the state-designated transportation planning and programming agency for San Bernardino County and as such is responsible for development of a long-range vision for the transportation system. The vision must be accountable and sensitive to local issues and needs as well as considering regional needs. This vision will be outlined in this Countywide Transportation Plan (CTP) which will promote the maintenance and development of San Bernardino County's transportation infrastructure. The CTP also identifies the preferred transportation investment policies and programs, levels of funding and funding strategies needed to address the sustainability and economic concerns of the County.

Prior to the development of a future roadmap, a clear assessment is needed of the existing setting from which a comprehensive strategy can be crafted based on forecast needs. The CTP identifies and presents a sustainable long-term plan to ensure mobility for the county's residents, businesses, workers and visitors. The flow chart above depicts the CTP development



process. The CTP is closely linked with the Measure I Strategic Plan which was developed to define the policy framework for delivery of the projects and Programs referenced in the Measure.

The CTP considers a range of projects and programs to satisfy future mobility needs. The CTP tested two scenarios based on different levels of transportation service and forecast funding. The Baseline Scenario includes projects that can be funded with traditionally available local, Measure I, State, and federal revenue sources through 2040. The Aggressive Scenario is a needs-based scenario assuming additional sources of revenue. However, the Aggressive Scenario is also consistent with the RTP/SCS "financially constrained" plan. This includes SCAG's "innovative revenues sources" contained in the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS, a substantial increase over traditionally available funding streams. This CTP does not recommend one scenario over the other, but delineates both to illustrate the transportation projects that could be implemented and maintained in each case.

Key to development of a long-range vision is a critical review of available resources to implement future plans and programs. Revenue forecasts were reviewed for the life of the CTP coinciding with the horizon of Measure I 2010-2040. Revenue streams from local, state and federal sources were identified and estimated. In order to develop a plan that can be funded, plan and program costs were estimated to ensure the long-range transportation vision can be sufficiently funded.

# **CTP Goals**

The development of the CTP was focused around several over-arching goals. The goals build off of the SANBAG Mission Statement and focus on the development of a multi-modal plan that addresses existing and future infrastructure needs and deficiencies in a cost effective manner. The goals of the CTP are to:

- Consolidate and integrate countywide transportation and land use planning efforts to provide more consistent input into the Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy
- Improve safety and mobility for all modes of travel in San Bernardino County by residents, businesses, employees, students and visitors
- Deliver transportation projects and services in a manner that promotes the County's economic competitiveness, affordable housing, environmental quality, overall sustainability, and access by the full spectrum of system users
- Promote stewardship of public resources entrusted to SANBAG and other transportation agencies in the County through cost-effective delivery, maintenance, and operation of transportation projects and services, and prudent use of taxpayer dollars
- Promote the planning and funding of a sustainable transportation system through a collaborative process with local, regional, state, federal, and private stakeholders

The long-range plan for San Bernardino County has historically been embedded within the SCAG RTP, without a separate countywide

### **CTP Considerations**

- Quantity and distribution of growth
- Nature and sequencing of major highway and transit projects
- Financial constraints to infrastructure investment
- Approaches to addressing County's air quality problem
- Long term funding options necessary to support the County's infrastructure and sustain its economic future

plan. However, given the complexity of today's issues and the growth of the County, a more detailed level of analysis is required to support effective decision making from a San Bernardino County perspective. The development of this CTP affords SANBAG and agency partners the opportunity to better define and take positions on a wide range of current issues.

The CTP goals are supported by underlying objectives which are smaller and measureable means by which the goals can be achieved. Objectives include reducing travel times, maximizing efficiency of the transportation system, reducing vehicle hours traveled, reducing vehicle emissions, increasing the share of people carpooling, bicycling, walking and taking transit, reducing transit vehicle wait times, reducing accidents, improving freeway, arterial and transit vehicle speeds, etc.

# **CTP Relationship to Countywide/Regional Planning Efforts**

The CTP must respond to infrastructure and transportation service needs of the county's citizens and businesses as well as legislation incorporated into the planning process. The CTP will serve as the input for San Bernardino County into the Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Community Strategies (RTP/SCS). The RTP/SCS is developed every four years by SCAG as a blueprint for the region guiding infrastructure development. The RTP/SCS includes projects and programs that serve specific mobility needs. The RTP/SCS must be consistent with State and federal legislation where applicable. The RTP provides input into the Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) which is updated every two years and includes all transportation-related projects requiring state and federal funding or approval by state and federal transportation agencies. Legislation incorporated into the RTP/SCS includes:

- Executive Order of the Governor of California S-3-05 (defined 2010, 2020 and 2050 GHG reduction targets, signed on June 1, 2005)
- Assembly Bill 32 (AB 32)
- Senate Bill 375 (SB 375)
- Assembly Bill 1358 (AB 1358)
- California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)
- Moving Ahead for Progress for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century (MAP-21)



San Bernardino has six acres of park land for every 1,000 residents, twice the state standard. Assembly Bill (AB) 32, the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 set 2020 greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions reduction goals into law. It directed the California Air Resources Board (CARB) to develop actions to reduce GHG emissions. Senate Bill (SB) 375, the Sustainable Communities and Climate

Protection Act of 2008 enhances California's ability to reach its AB 32

goals by promoting good planning with the goal of more sustainable communities. SB 375 defines specific regional GHG reduction targets and requires each Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) to complete a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) and integrate this into the RTP. SANBAG has executed a Sustainability MOU with SCAG demonstrating the agency's commitment to the SCS by assisting SCAG in meeting the GHG region-wide targets.

AB 1358, the Complete Streets Act, requires cities and counties, when updating the circulation element component of the general plan, to account for the needs of all roadway users. At the same time that AB 1358 was enacted in 2011, the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) released Deputy Directive 64 which embraces Complete Streets as the policy covering all phases of state highway projects from planning to construction to maintenance and repair. The directive reinforces the interrelationships of the local and regional multi-model systems.

SANBAG recently completed the Regional GHG Reduction Plan in response to AB 32 and SB 375 requirements. The Regional GHG Reduction Plan compiled an inventory of GHG emissions and developed reduction measures that could be adopted by the partner cities and San Bernardino County. Of the 24 cities throughout the county, 21 participated in the regional plan while one other city and the County of San Bernardino previously adopted local Climate Action Plans (CAP).

Infrastructure projects must comply with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) to protect the environment. Projects must assess environmental impacts associated with implementation and mitigate those impacts to ensure the protection of our natural environment.

In 2012, the Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Act (MAP-21) was enacted as the federal transportation bill that dictates surface transportation funding. MAP-21 is the successor transportation bill to the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) and is a two-year bill. The surface transportation bill outlines the various transportation programs and funding levels from the federal government.

### **Countywide Vision Statement**

We envision a complete county that capitalizes on the diversity of its people, its geography, and its economy to create a broad range of choices for its residents in how they live, work, and play.

We envision a vibrant economy with a skilled workforce that attracts who employers seize the opportunities presented by the county's unique advantages and provide the jobs that create countywide prosperity.

We envision a sustainable system of high-quality education, community health, public safety, housing, retail, recreation, arts and culture, and infrastructure, in which development complements our natural resources and environment.

We envision a model community which is governed in an open and ethical manner, where great ideas are replicated and brought to scale, and all sectors work collaboratively to reach shared goals.

From our valleys, across our mountains, and into our deserts, we envision a county that is a destination for visitors and a home for anyone seeking a sense of community and the best life has to offer. Locally, individual jurisdictions prepare General Plans or may conduct additional vision plans to address land use and infrastructure needs at the local level. General Plan circulation elements define long-range local transportation projects that may ultimately be incorporated into the CTP.

San Bernardino County, in cooperation with SANBAG, prepared a Vision for the county with the goals of partnering with all sectors of the community to support the success of every child from cradle to career and to establish San Bernardino County as a model in the state where local government, regulatory agencies and communities are business friendly. Aging population needs must also be considered during the post-career timeframe as the aging population continues to grow. The Countywide Vision focuses on the following elements, many of which have a direct correlation to the CTP:

- Jobs/Economy
- Education
- Housing
- Public Safety
- Infrastructure
- Quality of Life
- Environment
- Water
- Wellness



Components of the Countywide Vision are interwoven into the CTP. Although the Vision focuses on social, economic and political drivers to shape our future, there are linkages to the development and maintenance of the transportation system. For instance, it considers recreational trails, goods movement, aviation and clean transportation modes, recognizing that innovative planning is required to improve access to and the quality of the infrastructure systems. Availability of alternative modes of transportation such as bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure along with public transit opportunities has been shown to relate directly to wellness and improved public health.

As part of the Visioning process, an online survey was performed with over 3,650 respondents. Availability of jobs and quality of roads

| he  | Vision Survey   |  |  |
|-----|---|--|--|
| an  | Top Three Likes about SB County:                            | Top Three Dislikes about SB County:                  |  |
| as  | <ul> <li>Availability of recreational facilities</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Lack of employment opportunities</li> </ul> |  |
| /er | <ul> <li>Availability of affordable housing</li> </ul>      | <ul> <li>Overall county image</li> </ul>             |  |
| ts. | <ul> <li>Availability of restaurants/shopping</li> </ul>    | <ul> <li>Quality of roads</li> </ul>                 |  |
| bs  |   |  |  |

were at the top of the list of things respondents disliked most about the county. Respondents believe that traffic congestion and quality of roads are getting worse rather than improving while nearly half or more than half believe that air quality, availability of other transportation options and availability of public transit are remaining the same. The top suggestion for improvements in the County was related to transportation infrastructure. The CTP's transportation strategy supports the Countywide Vision. SANBAG has prepared several planning documents that support the CTP. These include the Non-Motorized Transportation Plan (NMTP), the Long-Range Transit Plan (LRTP) and the Victor Valley Area Transportation Study (VVATS). The NMTP identifies active transportation opportunities and constraints throughout the County and identifies a bicycle plan. The LRTP evaluates existing and planned transit service, identifies existing and forecast deficiencies, and proposes a course of action for planning and implementation of future transit investments. VVATS evaluated long-range transportation infrastructure needs throughout the Victor Valley. Various other topics are addressed by the CTP, including:



- Congestion Management
- Environmental Impacts
- Corridor Preservation
- Goods Movement
- Infrastructure Maintenance
- Transit Needs
- Advanced Technology and Alternative Fuels
- Market Incentives

The California Transportation Plan is a statewide, longrange transportation policy plan to address California's

future multimodal mobility needs and reduce GHG emissions. The plan defines performance-based goals, policies and strategies to achieve the state's collective vision for an integrated and sustainable multimodal transportation system. The keys to the vision are the three E's of sustainability; a prosperous economy, human and environmental health and social equity. The primary goals of the plan are to:

- Improve multimodal mobility and accessibility for all people
- Preserve the multimodal transportation system
- Support a vibrant economy
- Improve public safety and security
- Foster livable and healthy communities and promote social equity
- Practice environmental stewardship

The SANBAG CTP builds off of the core goals of the state plan, focusing on local policies and objectives that will help achieve these goals locally.



# II. State of the Subregion

The past few decades have seen rapid growth throughout San Bernardino County (refer to **Figure II-1**). Along with this population growth, the transportation system has matured and expanded to continue to serve mobility needs throughout the County. Challenges continue to exist in maintaining and expanding the transportation system to serve the needs of current and future users.

## **Physical Environment**

San Bernardino County is the largest county in the contiguous United States covering over 20,000 square miles of land. The County includes 24



incorporated cities with the population focused primarily in the southwestern portion of the County. Over 80% of the unincorporated land throughout the county is owned by governmental or tribal agencies. San Bernardino County is geographically located between Los Angeles County and the Arizona border (Refer to **Figure I-1**). This strategic geographic location has resulted in an extensive roadway and rail network serving local, regional and national travel markets. Existing development of the County's transportation infrastructure is rooted in the county's varying topography. The San Bernardino Mountains separate the Valley from the desert areas, and much of the transportation system and land development grew around the rail infrastructure as it followed the topography. This resulted in:

- Major transportation corridors (rail and highway) through mountain passes (Cajon to the north and Banning to the east)
- Urban areas in the most populated communities of the southwest county
- A growing Victor Valley comprised of four cities with expansive residential and supporting commercial development
- Resort communities in the San Bernardino Mountains and along the Colorado River
- Vast desert areas with scattered rural communities
- Unique mining resources in open desert spaces,
- Significant natural resources such as Joshua Tree National Park and Mojave National Preserve, and major U.S. Army and Marine training and material depots

# **Environmental Setting**

San Bernardino County is blessed with vast environmental resources and recreational opportunities. The San Bernardino National Forest is a nationally significant eco-system and home to an array of wildlife. The deserts support habitats and species, such as the desert tortoise and Joshua Trees that have provided some of the signature images of the County over the years. The Mojave River and Santa Ana River basins are not only major drainages but support several federally or state-listed threatened

and endangered species.

San Bernardino County has also been known for its air quality challenges. Although tremendous progress has been made on air quality improvement in the last several decades, the county remains one of the more polluted regions of the U.S. There is a distinct relationship between transportation and air quality and long-term exposure to high concentrations of air pollutants has been linked to breathing and heart problems. Transportation is a major contributor to criteria



pollutants such as particulate matter (PM) and oxides of nitrogen (NOx), a precursor to ozone formation. Transportation is also responsible for close to 40% of the greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions statewide (Figure II-2). It is important to note that clean air has positive health impacts on the county's population.

San Bernardino County is located within two air basins: the South Coast Air Basin and the Mojave Desert Air Basin. While both Air Basins have seen dramatically improved air quality, as presented in Figure II-3, additional strategies must be implemented to meet the standards set by the Environmental Protection Agency. This CTP must be developed recognizing that San Bernardino County will need to assist the region in attaining national air quality standards as well as meeting state GHG reduction targets.

SB 375 has mandated reductions in greenhouse gas emissions from automobiles and light duty trucks through regional Sustainable Communities Strategies. The California Air Resources Board (CARB) established regional targets for GHG transportation emission reductions for 2020 and 2035. As part of the 2012-2035 Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy SCAG developed strategies to meet these targets. One of the strategies to reduce GHG emissions includes better coordination of transportation and land use to reduce sprawl and cluster new development along transit corridors. CARB is taking additional technology–related GHG reduction initiatives for both light duty vehicles as well as the freight transportation sector through promotion of cleaner and more efficient sea vessels, trains, trucks and autos. The California Transportation Plan has introduced scenarios that demonstrate a path to achieving the aggressive reductions in GHG emissions specified in Executive Orders on GHG emission reduction. Further, CARB has released the draft paper "Sustainable Freight: Pathways to Zero and Near-Zero Emissions," which serves as a basis for discussion of ways to reduce emissions from the freight sector.

### **Demographic Environment**

Over the past several decades, San Bernardino has grown by more than 40% since 1990, reaching more than 2 million residents. San Bernardino County has the fifth largest population in California and twelfth largest of any county in the nation. The 2010 U.S. Census population for San Bernardino County was 2,035,210, approximately 20% greater than in 2000.



Figure II-3: PM 2.5 Days above National 24-Hour Standard in Southern California

Source: County of San Bernardino

The County population continued to climb an additional 1.6% to 2.07 million by 2012. While the land in the San Bernardino Valley covers less than 2.5 percent of the county, population is concentrated in the valley, housing 70% of the county's residents. Another 15% of the county population currently resides in Victor Valley with the remainder spread across mountain and desert communities. **Figure II-4** summarizes existing countywide land use types while **Figure II-5** presents 2012 countywide population density. In **Figure II-4**, most of the vacant land is government-owned and not developable.

**Table II-1** presents the base year 2012 population and employment values for San Bernardino County. It should be noted that the City of Big Bear Lake and other mountain communities are unique in that the full-time population and associated employment is small (about 5,000 and 3,800 respectively), but the population and employment increase substantially in the peak season, particularly on weekends. For example, the City and SANBAG have estimated that employment increases by approximately 2,000 in the peak season and some 60,000 visitors (part time residents, hotel guests, and others) are added to the population. This puts demands on the transportation system that go well beyond the seemingly small permanent population and employment numbers.

| Jurisdiction                        | Population | Employment |
|-------------------------------------|------------|------------|
| Adelanto                            | 31,145     | 3,885      |
| Apple Valley                        | 70,162     | 15,417     |
| Barstow                             | 23,069     | 8,135      |
| Big Bear Lake                       | 5,094      | 3,840      |
| Chino                               | 79,447     | 42,580     |
| Chino Hills                         | 75,765     | 11,471     |
| Colton                              | 52,768     | 16,826     |
| Fontana                             | 200,228    | 47,011     |
| Grand Terrace                       | 12,200     | 2,153      |
| Hesperia                            | 91,122     | 14,909     |
| Highland                            | 53,739     | 5,532      |
| Loma Linda                          | 23,409     | 16,665     |
| Montclair                           | 37,198     | 16,523     |
| Needles                             | 4,898      | 2,235      |
| Ontario                             | 166,328    | 103,312    |
| Rancho Cucamonga                    | 170,104    | 69,901     |
| Redlands                            | 69,585     | 31,732     |
| Rialto                              | 100,836    | 21,076     |
| San Bernardino (City)               | 211,943    | 88,576     |
| Twentynine Palms                    | 25,875     | 4,336      |
| Upland                              | 74,660     | 31,684     |
| Victorville                         | 119,595    | 29,794     |
| Yucaipa                             | 52,270     | 8,160      |
| Yucca Valley                        | 20,951     | 6,053      |
| Unincorporated County               | 295,587    | 57,357     |
| County<br>Source: SCAG, SANBAG 2014 | 2,067,978  | 659,163    |

### Table II-1: San Bernardino County 2012 Population/Employment

Source: SCAG, SANBAG 2014



### Figure II-4: San Bernardino County Existing Land Uses

**II-6** Countywide Transportation Plan - FINAL



### Figure II-5: Existing Population Density

San Bernardino County employment has historically risen with the increase in population; however, the jobs-housing balance remains less than 1 job per housing unit, which translates into a net export of workers from San Bernardino County to jobs in neighboring counties. **Figure II-6** demonstrates the

lasting effect of the recent recession on San Bernardino County through a comparison of annual median income relative to state and national totals. In 2012, San Bernardino County dropped below the national average for the first time. **Figure II-7** presents historic countywide employment that also demonstrates the effects of the recession while **Figure II-8** presents 2012 countywide employment density. The recent economic recession has had an impact on San Bernardino County as employment dropped from pre-recession levels.

<u>72,600</u>: Jobs lost countywide from 2007 to 2011

<u>55,300:</u> Jobs regained countywide from 2011 to 2015

Source: CA Employment Development Department



Figure II-7: Employment by Clusters with Greater than 20,000 Jobs




### Figure II-8: Existing Employment Density

# **Highways**

Several key Interstate and State Highways traverse the County and provide primary access to the remainder of the region. **Figure II-9** presents the existing freeway system throughout the County. The countywide road network includes over 22,000 centerline miles of highway/freeway general purpose lanes and 96 miles of existing freeway high occupancy vehicle lanes with 20 additional lane-miles under construction to be completed by 2015 (I-215). San Bernardino freeways have long been key regional and national assets as they include critical trade corridors between Southern California and the remainder of the United States.





The most recent addition to the regional freeway system was the extension of SR-210 during the 2000's, with completion in 2007, from its previous terminus in Los Angeles County from just east of SR-57 to the former alignment of SR-30 at I-215. The reconstruction of I-215 from Orange Show Road to SR-210 was completed in 2014. San Bernardino Freeways experience congestion during peak periods although the recession has resulted in less peak period freeway congestion. The completion of SR-210 also

demonstrably reduced congestion on I-10. **Figure II-11** demonstrates freeway performance levels primarily in the Valley portion of San Bernardino County from 2003 to 2012 for AM and PM vehicle hours of peak period delay according to the Caltrans Performance Measurement System (PeMS). Traffic congestion peaked in years 2005 through 2007. The completion of the 210 freeway in 2007 also seems to be one of the factors in the reduced vehicle hours of delay in subsequent years.





Figure II-10: Historical AM Peak Period PeMS Delay

Source: Caltrans Freeway Performance Monitoring System (PeMS)



Figure II-11: Historical PM Peak Period PeMS Delay



# **Arterial System**

As the county has been settled and developed, the arterial system has taken form. Arterials complement the freeway system and facilitate local and regional travel. A countywide Nexus Study Network has been defined to guide future widening and expansion of the arterial system. The Nexus Study Network includes arterials that provide access to the freeway, serve inter-jurisdictional traffic, etc. Congestion is experienced throughout the arterial system due to heavy traffic demands, capacity constraints and signal or stop-controlled intersections. The performance of the arterial system is also impacted by the condition of the pavement. Local jurisdictions monitor pavement conditions and attempt to maintain the system to ensure efficient movement of vehicles.

# **Modeling Analysis of Highway System**

The San Bernardino Transportation Analysis Model (SBTAM) was applied to generate base year forecast data for the highway system. The base year of SBTAM is 2012 while the horizon year is 2040, consistent with the SCAG regional model that will be applied for the 2016 RTP/SCS. The transportation model has been used to forecast future conditions so that future scenarios can be evaluated and compared to current and future conditions. Base year 2012 countywide person trip summaries are included in **Table II-2** while vehicle miles traveled, vehicle hours traveled and vehicle hours of delay are summarized in **Table II-3**. **Table II-2** demonstrates the linkages San Bernardino has to our neighboring counties with heavy daily trip interactions with Los Angeles and Riverside Counties. **Figure II-12** presents the AM peak period system performance while **Figure II-13** presents the PM peak period system performance.

|                |          |             |            |           | San        |           |            |
|----------------|----------|-------------|------------|-----------|------------|-----------|------------|
| COUNTY         | Imperial | Los Angeles | Orange     | Riverside | Bernardino | Ventura   | TOTAL      |
| Imperial       | 456,319  | 1,478       | 591        | 6,428     | 1,759      | 146       | 466,720    |
| Los Angeles    | 4,809    | 31,248,637  | 1,068,155  | 114,284   | 459,320    | 328,511   | 33,223,715 |
| Orange         | 1,761    | 1,058,990   | 9,770,095  | 107,584   | 104,355    | 17,240    | 11,060,024 |
| Riverside      | 15,966   | 231,067     | 245,424    | 5,612,207 | 475,334    | 9,592     | 6,589,589  |
| San Bernardino | 4,690    | 566,391     | 181,417    | 394,392   | 5,267,053  | 12,220    | 6,426,162  |
| Ventura        | 803      | 374,406     | 19,790     | 5,088     | 12,729     | 2,353,590 | 2,766,407  |
| TOTAL          | 484,347  | 33,480,968  | 11,285,471 | 6,239,982 | 6,320,550  | 2,721,299 | 60,532,616 |

### Table II-2: SBTAM County to County Person Trip Summaries

| rable in or oppration bernaralito county renormance of atoms |                           |                           |                           |                  |  |
|--|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|------------------|--|
| Facility Type  | Vehicle Miles<br>Traveled | Vehicle Hours<br>Traveled | Vehicle Hours of<br>Delay | Average<br>Speed |  |
| Freeway  | 36,660,568                | 639,479                   | 68,113                    | 57.3             |  |
| Principal Arterial   | 7,888,089                 | 221,647                   | 41,084                    | 35.6             |  |
| Minor Arterial   | 8,108,461                 | 226,534                   | 23,336                    | 35.8             |  |
| Collector  | 3,805,710                 | 115,764                   | 8,450                     | 32.9             |  |
| Total  | 56,462,829                | 1,203,423                 | 140,982                   | 46.9             |  |

### Table II-3: SBTAM San Bernardino County Performance Statistics

Source: SBTAM

### Figure II-12: Base Year 2012 AM Peak Period Transportation System Performance



Source: SBTAM



Figure II-13: Base Year 2012 PM Peak Period Transportation System Performance

Source: SBTAM

# Transit

Transit provides an opportunity for reducing vehicle miles traveled (VMT) through shifts from low occupancy modes of travel with significant economic, environmental and quality of life benefits to the community. Investment in transit is increasingly essential as demands on transit services increase due to population and economic growth. Improvement and coordination of transit service to key industry clusters strengthens regional economic competitiveness as well as personal mobility.

The San Bernardino Valley covers less than 2.5% of the land area in the county but houses over 70% of the residents and accounts for over 90% of current county transit ridership.

SANBAG is currently developing a Short Range Transit Plan (SRTP) to establish regional transit mobility goals and objectives and to address regional transit needs. The SRTP will identify transit service plans and help prioritize major capital improvement projects for the region's transit needs to help guide transit service improvements over the next five years. The proposed SANBAG regional goals are:

• Network Connectivity — Coordinate and integrate the transit services of the various transit operators throughout the County

State of the Subregion 2015

- Inter-Regional Transit Travel Facilitate inter-regional transit travel between regions of the County as well as between San Bernardino County and other counties
- Access for All Seek cost-effective accessibility programs to improve mobility for seniors and persons with disabilities
- Commuter Rail Service Support continued development and enhancement of commuter rail service in San Bernardino County
- Key Projects Implement projects that will support the SRTP's goals, including:
  - Carpool and vanpool services, including expanded regional vanpool services
  - Downtown San Bernardino Passenger Rail Project
  - San Bernardino Transit Center
  - Redlands Passenger Rail Project

Six transit agencies provide bus service coverage to over 90% of the County's population (refer to **Figure II-14).** Combined, these local agencies - Barstow Area Transit (BAT), Morongo Basin Transit Authority (MBTA), Mountain Area Regional Transit Authority (MARTA), Needles Area Transit (NAT), Omnitrans, and Victor Valley Transit Authority (VVTA) - carry over 18.5 million people annually. There are ongoing efforts to identify efficiencies to improve the overall level of service through a reduction in administrative costs. The vast majority of ridership (16 million) is centered within the densely populated San Bernardino Valley. **Table II-4** provides a summary of annual ridership and service hours for these agencies. In addition to fixed route buses, other services offered include demand-response and bus rapid transit. Local agencies develop their own transit plans according to data collected about existing and potential customer needs. In response to travel demand, each agency determines the time frame and intervals that their vehicles will run.

### Table II-4: Existing San Bernardino Transit Service Provider Summary

|  | Annual Ridership | Total Service |  |  |  |
|--|------------------|---------------|--|--|--|
| Service Provider                         | (FY 2013)        | Hours         |  |  |  |
| Barstow Area Transit                     | 210,062          | 37,998        |  |  |  |
| Morongo Basin Transit Authority          | 380,748          | 69,241        |  |  |  |
| Mountain Area Regional Transit Authority | 153,408          | 52,676        |  |  |  |
| Needles Area Transit                     | 38,705           | 4,438         |  |  |  |
| Omnitrans                                | 16,146,278       | 1,431,926     |  |  |  |
| Victor Valley Transit Authority          | 2,151,301        | 373,852       |  |  |  |
| Total                                    | 19,080,502       | 1,970,131     |  |  |  |

Omnitrans, MBTA, and VVTA are working to increase access to connect veterans, active military personnel, and their families with services and destinations they use most often. Additionally, each of the six transit agencies has supplemental programs that aid seniors and persons with disabilities, helping to improve mobility around the County. Goals and objectives of the various transit operators have consistent themes and include:

- Safety
- Reliability
- Minimize service duplication
- Solicit Input on services from public
- Minimize operating cost
- Increase ridership
- Expand geographic reach
- Expand span of service



Figure II-14: San Bernardino County Transit System

### **Barstow Area Transit**

Barstow Area Transit (BAT) provides fixed route bus service for the City of Barstow and surrounding areas of San Bernardino County, including the communities of Lenwood, Hinkley, Yermo, Grandview, Harvard, Daggett and Newberry Springs. Two San Bernardino County supported specialized services for seniors and persons with disabilities serve the communities of Big River and Trona. BAT serves more than 200,000 annual passengers. BAT merged with Victor Valley Transit Authority in 2015 to realize cost savings and achieve more efficient transit administration.



# Morongo Basin Transit Authority

Morongo Basin Transit Authority (MBTA) is a Joint Powers Authority (JPA) that operates fixed route local bus service throughout the Morongo Basin including within the City of Twentynine Palms and the Town of Yucca Valley. MBTA provides a feeder service called Ready Ride which offers doorto-door demand response vehicle service for the disabled and seniors.

# Mountain Area Regional Transit Authority





Mountain Area Regional Transit Authority (MARTA) is a JPA that serves mountain communities in the Big Bear Valley, Running Springs, Crestline, Lake Arrowhead and Blue Jay through fixed route local bus service. The agency also provides two "Off the Mountain" routes from Big Bear Valley and Lake Arrowhead to downtown San Bernardino. MARTA's Off the Mountain Services connects passengers with Metrolink and Greyhound stations in San

Bernardino. Dial-a-Ride paratransit services are also available for seniors and disabled passengers living more than a quarter mile beyond MARTA's fixed routes.

# **Needles Area Transit**

Needles Area Transit (NAT) system transports approximately 38,000 annual riders with fixed route services throughout the City of Needles and dial-a-ride provisions for seniors and persons with disabilities.

# s a

# **Omnitrans**

Established in 1976 through a joint powers agreement, Omnitrans serves approximately 16 million annual passengers throughout its 480 square mile service area, covering 15 cities and portions of the unincorporated areas of San Bernardino County. Omnitrans is administered by a Board of Directors comprised of a Mayor or City Council Member from each member jurisdiction and all five County of San Bernardino Supervisors.

As part of its fixed route system, Omnitrans serves an increasingly crucial feeder service role for Metrolink. Metrolink stations in Montclair, Fontana and downtown San Bernardino (opening in 2015/2016) also serve as Omnitrans hubs.





In addition to vital fixed routes operating on city streets and local freeways, Omnitrans provides specialized services including sbX Bus Rapid Transit (BRT), OmniGo, and paratransit Access. Omnitrans sbX BRT service provides express service along a 15.7 mile corridor between northern San Bernardino (California State University, San Bernardino) and Loma Linda (Veterans Administration Hospital), connecting key university, government, business, entertainment, medical center, and park-and-ride facilities. OmniGo is comprised of three circulator service routes serving the communities of Chino Hills, Grand Terrace, and Yucaipa focused on

connecting major destinations, including schools, senior centers, and shopping centers. Finally, Access operates under the guidelines of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) to provide service for those who are unable to independently use the fixed routes for all or some of their trips up to  $\frac{3}{2}$ -mile on either side of an existing bus route.

# Victor Valley Transit Authority

Victor Valley Transit Authority (VVTA) is a JPA established in 1991 that serves a 424 square mile service area in the Victor Valley with a population over 300,000. VVTA is comprised of five jurisdictions: the cities of Adelanto, Hesperia, and Victorville, the Town of Apple Valley, and several unincorporated areas of San Bernardino County including Phelan, Pinon Hills, Wrightwood, Lucerne Valley, Helendale, and Oro Grande. VVTA provides feeder services, B-V Link, which connects Barstow, Victorville, and the San Bernardino Valley. The NTC routes connecting residents from Fort Irwin to Victorville and Barstow. VVTA also actively promotes ridesharing through a vanpool subsidy program for groups of seven to fifteen people enabling them to share their commute to work.



# Valley Transportation Services



Valley Transportation Services (VTrans) is a not-for-profit Consolidated Transportation Services Agency dedicated to improving mobility for seniors,



disabled, and persons of low income. VTrans currently operates programs in the San Bernardino Valley area, including one on one or group Travel Training. VTrans is also a project sponsor for a variety of other human

service transportation programs, such as volunteer driver mileage reimbursement programs and agency directly provided trips.

### Rail

The Southern California Regional Rail Authority (SCRRA) is the joint powers authority that operates the Metrolink commuter rail system. This system serves Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, Ventura and San Bernardino Counties (refer to **Figure II-15** which includes the downtown Los Angeles core urban rail system for information). Metrolink served an average of 45,050 passengers per day throughout the total system in



**METROLINK**.

2012 with the San Bernardino Line serving the most passengers, approximately 12,000 per day. The daily passengers served by the stations in San Bernardino are presented in **Table II-4**. Based on the most recent Metrolink passenger survey, three out of four Metrolink passengers use the system at least four days a week and 73% of riders rate their overall satisfaction with Metrolink as *Good* or *Excellent*.

Construction is currently ongoing for the extension of Metrolink into Downtown San Bernardino concurrent with the construction of a new transit hub located in Downtown San Bernardino. These facilities will enhance the reach of the rail system enabling Metrolink to connect with both the E Street sbX Bus Rapid Transit line and the future Redlands Passenger Rail line at the San Bernardino Transit Center.

Environmental approvals have been obtained for the Redlands Passenger Rail Project, and SANBAG is proceeding with design. Initiation of passenger rail service to Redlands is anticipated in the 2018 timeframe. Stations will include downtown San Bernardino, Hospitality/Tippecanoe, New York Avenue, downtown Redlands and the University of Redlands. The expansions of rail service will not only address passenger needs but also help the region satisfy AB 32 (Global Warming Solutions Act) and SB 375 (Sustainable Communities Strategies) goals, facilitating transit oriented development (TOD) in the station areas.



Passenger traffic in the SCAG region using Metrolink/Amtrak commuter services is projected to grow by 60% to 100% by 2035. Current demand warrants consideration of additional express train service from the San Bernardino and Rancho Cucamonga stations, but implementation will require double tracking for an additional four miles of the line. Of the 38 daily Metrolink trains on the San Bernardino Line, two (one in each direction) are express trains.



Figure II-15: Regional Rail Network

| Station           | 2012  | 2011  |
|-------------------|-------|-------|
| San Bernardino    | 945   | 850   |
| Rialto            | 370   | 340   |
| Fontana           | 480   | 490   |
| Rancho Cucamonga  | 1,165 | 1,120 |
| Upland            | 620   | 630   |
| Montclair         | 380   | 390   |
| Source: Motrolink |       |       |

# Table II-4: San Bernardino County MetrolinkStation Average Daily Boardings

Source: Metrolink

# **Goods Movement/Freight**

San Bernardino County has long been a gateway to the Southland. The Cajon Pass from the north and the San Gorgonio Pass (also known as the Banning Pass) from the east were logical locations for the establishment of transnational routes into and out of the Southern California region in the 1800s.

Phineas Banning is known as the "Father of Los Angeles Harbor"

In 1829, traders opened a route between Los Angeles and Santa Fe via the Cajon Pass, providing a vital economic link between the two Mexican cities of that day. The trade route was later used by the American adventurer John C. Frémont and his guide, Kit Carson, who named the corridor the Old Spanish Trail and advertised it as a link between the coast and the interior of the new American West. This later became known as part of the National Old Trails Road, which was designated Route 66 in 1926. After coming down Cajon Pass, Route 66 generally followed the alignment of today's Interstate 215 to downtown San Bernardino and then turned due west toward Los Angeles and Santa Monica.



Route 66 and U.S. 395 at one time merged in Hesperia and diverged in San Bernardino as U.S. 395 headed south toward San Diego. Interstate 15 (the Mojave Freeway) was built over the Cajon Summit in 1969 and together with Interstate 40 is now one of the primary truck corridors to and from the Midwest.

The California Southern Railroad, a subsidiary of the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railway, built the first rail line to use the Cajon Pass as a route through the mountains. The line was built in the early 1880s as part of a connection between the present day cities of Barstow and San Diego. The Southern Pacific Railroad Company

built its own track, known as the Palmdale-Colton Cutoff, through the pass in 1966/1967.

In terms of the eastern gateway, the first stagecoach line came through the Banning Pass in 1862. The pass is named for Phineas Banning, stagecoach line owner, founder of Wilmington, and known as the "Father of Los Angeles Harbor." The east-west U.S. Route 99 was built in 1923, generally following the route of today's Interstate 10. The Southern Pacific railroad followed in the late 1870s, eventually purchased by the Union Pacific railroad of today.

This legacy as a gateway has lived on today, shaping not only the San Bernardino Valley, but the High Desert communities as well. The growth of freight movement in San Bernardino County has generally tracked the growth of the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach, together the largest port complex in the United States. The significance of the gateway through San Bernardino County has increased as the ports have grown.

The combination of geographic location, relationship to the ports, and worldclass transportation infrastructure continue to provide San Bernardino County with economic opportunities into the future. But these opportunities must be managed well, if the County is to continue to benefit from its ongoing strategic advantages as the gateway to Southern California.

Goods movement is essential to support the economy and quality of life in the Southern California region. The Southern California region is the largest international trade gateway in the United States, supported by marine ports, air cargo facilities, railroads, and freeways. In 2012, over \$48 billion of trade passed through the Southern California ports of entry.

The distribution and logistics sector employs 123,000 workers in San Bernardino County Much of that trade filters through San Bernardino County to the remainder of the country on rail. Two Class I railroads now serve the region: Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railway (BNSF) and the Union Pacific Railroad (UP). These railroads handle the vast majority of rail cargo in the region. BNSF operates an intermodal rail yard in downtown San Bernardino adjacent to the historic Santa Fe Depot while UP operates a classification yard in Rialto and Colton parallel to the I-10 freeway (refer to **Figure II-16**).

Freight movement is a significant component of the goods movement economy of San Bernardino County. Goods that enter at the Port of Long Beach or Port of Los Angeles that are distributed by rail throughout the nation must travel through the BNSF and UP rail lines in San Bernardino. The distribution and logistics sector employs 123,000 workers in San Bernardino County and is currently the fastest growing sector, representing approximately 20% of the County's employment.



Approximately 40% of the nation's containerized freight flows through the ports, and 80% of that funnels through San Bernardino County by rail and truck. The County is home to an extensive network of warehouse and distribution facilities, some 200 million square feet of warehouse facilities, or approximately 25% of the regional total. Many of these are large high-cube facilities designed to meet demands for automation and adaptability to the dynamics of today's supply chains. Some of the well-known most players in wholesaling, retailing, and housed e-commerce are here, examples of which include: Amazon,



# Ashley Furniture, Best Buy, Coca-Cola, COSTCO, Dr. Pepper, Kohls, Mattel, Pep Boys, Pepsi, Stater Brothers, Target, and Walmart. Both UPS and FedEx run major operations out of Ontario International Airport. **Figure II-17** shows the extent of developed industrial/warehousing land use in the Valley and Victor Valley.

Heavy daily freight train traffic result in vehicle delays at arterial crossings in the San Bernardino Valley and Victor Valley. In addition, freight train traffic must coexist with passenger rail traffic, creating additional operational challenges for freight and passenger movement through the region (Refer to **Figure II-16**). **Figure II-18**: Railroad Crossing Locations presents the various rail/arterial interfaces throughout the county. While there are many grade separations, many at-grade crossings still exist which present safety issues and growing traffic congestion as the use of the rail lines and traffic demands increase.

The nexus of an extensive transportation network (air, highway, rail – refer to **Figure II-19**) along with available and relatively affordable land make San Bernardino an ideal location for manufacturing, warehousing and distribution facilities. As a result of the expansive warehousing operations located throughout San Bernardino County and the location with respect to the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach and the remainder of the United States, freeways throughout the county experience heavy truck traffic (Refer to **Figure II-20**).





Figure II-17: Developed Industrial/Warehousing Land Use



Figure II-18: Railroad Crossing Locations

State of the Subregion 2015



Figure II-19: Freeway, Rail Lines and Intermodal Facilities



Figure II-20: Existing San Bernardino County Daily Truck Volumes

# **Freight and Air Quality**

San Bernardino County is covered by both the South Coast and Mojave Air Quality Management Districts (AQMDs). **Figure II-21** presents the coverage of the two districts. The South Coast AQMD is a federally designated "extreme non-attainment area." The South Coast AQMD portion of San Bernardino County suffers from the worst 24-hour PM 2.5 concentrations and worst 1-hour and 8-hour ozone concentrations in Southern California – between 130 and 180 percent of federal standards, with a significant portion of this impact stemming from goods movement activities. Since long-term exposure to high concentrations of particulate matter and high levels of ozone has been linked to breathing and heart problems, cleaning up the air has been and will continue to be a priority to improve the health of county residents, workers and visitors.





Preliminary ozone air quality analysis currently underway in the development of the 2016 AQMP indicates that NOx emissions will need to be reduced by approximately 50% in 2023 and 65% in 2031 (beyond projected 2023 baseline emissions). Projected emissions of NOx from three goods movement sources alone – ships, trains and heavy duty diesel trucks – will be above what is needed to achieve the federal 8-hour ozone standard by 2023, under existing regulations (refer to **Figure II-22**). Not satisfying federal ozone and air quality standards can jeopardize receiving federal transportation funding.



Figure II-22: NOx Emission Reductions to Achieve Federal 8-Hour Ozone Ambient Air Quality Standards

Source: 2016 AQMP White Paper, SCAQMD, September 2015

Tremendous progress has been made on air quality over the last several decades. For example, maximum levels of ozone, one of the South Coast AQMD's worst smog problems, have been cut to less than one quarter of what they were in the 1950s, even though today the region has nearly three times as many people and four times as many vehicles. In the past decade, Stage I smog alerts have been eliminated, which previously occurred 100-120 times a year. The South Coast AQMD has not reached Stage II levels since the 1980s.

However, the freight sector (ships, intermodal facilities, trains, and trucks) will require further advances for the region to reach federal attainment goals for particulates and ozone. This will require a balanced approach to maintain regional and national competitiveness in manufacturing/logistics while at the same time cleaning up the freight sector from an air quality standpoint. San Bernardino County, although it has some of the worst air quality in the region, cannot afford to lose the jobs associated with the logistics industry while this transition occurs.

Conflicts between industrial/warehouse development and residential communities are of concern as well. Impacts include noise from trucks and trains, localized traffic congestion, and visual impacts, among others.

SANBAG and Caltrans, in partnership with local governments, have invested approximately \$2.5 billion in the County's transportation network since 2000, significantly benefitting freight mobility. Noteworthy investments include SR-210 completion, I-215 widening and reconstruction of the Devore (I-15/I-215 junction), four freight-related interchanges, eight rail/highway grade separations and the Colton Crossing rail/rail grade separation.

The largest source of funds for the above projects (40%) has been from local Measure I sales tax revenue. Federal funds comprise 25% and state funds the remaining 35%. This speaks to the serious commitment SANBAG and its local and state partners have made to building and maintaining the highway network for both passenger car traffic and trucks.

# Airports

Several airports serve the county including general aviation, international, and cargo-focused airports:

- Los Angeles(LA)/Ontario International (ONT)
- San Bernardino International (SBIA)
- Southern California Logistics
- Apple Valley
- Baker
- Barstow-Daggett
- Chino
- Needles
- Twentynine Palms
- Big Bear City
- Cable (Upland)
- Hesperia
- Redlands Municipal



Figure II-23: Ontario International Passengers



Regional airports handled almost \$90 billion in international cargo in 2012. The air cargo system in Southern California ranks 2<sup>nd</sup> in value of traded goods. LA/Ontario International Airport, San Bernardino International Airport and the Southern California Logistics Airport provide cargo services as part of the goods movement chain through the Southern California region. The majority of passenger activity is served by Ontario International Airport although it has experienced a sharp decline in passenger activity

from its peak of 7.21 million annual passengers in 2007 to approximately 4.3 million in 2012 (Refer to **Figure II-23**). Refer to **Figure II-19** for the location of airports throughout the county. The possible transfer of control of ONT from Los Angeles World Airports to the City of Ontario is discussed later in this report.

# **Active Transportation**

A safe, interconnected cycling and walking system can be a major asset to individual communities and to an urban area, particularly one as well suited to these activities as San Bernardino County. The climate and topography are highly conducive for these and other outdoor pursuits. Both natural and man-made corridors provide ideal opportunities for

There are roughly 500 miles of bicycle paths countywide

development of a comprehensive system of cycling facilities, pathways, and trails. Even though San Bernardino County is known for its recreational opportunities, such a system is not well developed in many areas of the County. **Figure II-24** presents the existing and planned non-motorized facilities throughout the County.

While the County experienced an eight-fold increase in bicycle infrastructure between 2001 and 2011 (currently there are roughly 500 miles of bicycle paths, lanes, and routes countywide), a particular emphasis is being placed on commuter-related and other utilitarian cycling. Statistics from the American Community Survey (2006-2009) indicate the percentage of trips to work by bicycling and walking in San Bernardino County varies by jurisdiction but is roughly only 0.4% countywide. The walk-to-work



percentage is higher, but still only about 1.5%, and this statistic is skewed by very high walkto-work percentages at the Twentynine Palms Marine Base. As indicated in **Table II-5**, the percent of trips to work by bicycle are low throughout the Southern California Counties, and much of the rest of the United States, so this is a large scale issue that San Bernardino County is not facing alone.





### Figure II-24: San Bernardino County Bicycle Facilities

### Table II-5: Non-Motorized Trips to Work

| County         | Total Trips<br>to Work | Bike Trips | Walk Trips | % Bike<br>Trips | % Walk<br>Trips |
|----------------|------------------------|------------|------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Los Angeles    | 3,858,750              | 20,975     | 54,630     | 0.54%           | 1.42%           |
| Orange         | 1,313,985              | 9,500      | 13,220     | 0.72%           | 1.01%           |
| San Bernardino | 658,710                | 2,475      | 10,070     | 0.38%           | 1.53%           |
| Riverside      | 590,515                | 2,825      | 5,810      | 0.48%           | 0.98%           |
| Ventura        | 345,660                | 2,165      | 3,930      | 0.63%           | 1.14%           |
| Imperial       | 43,205                 | 195        | 685        | 0.45%           | 1.59%           |
| Total          | 6,810,825              | 38,135     | 88,345     | 0.56%           | 1.30%           |

SANBAG first adopted the San Bernardino County Non-Motorized Transportation Plan (NMTP) in 2001 and has continued to update the NMTP to reflect current local jurisdiction. In addition to representing local efforts, the NMTP also focuses on planning for more walkable communities within and around transit station areas. This is in part a response to the initiatives to reduce vehicle travel and GHG

emissions embedded in California Senate Bill (SB) 375 and as well as part of a larger endeavor to develop a Sustainable Communities Strategy (SCS) which will become part of the SCAG RTP. The SCS seeks to improve land use around transit stations and provide pedestrian/bicycle connectivity and amenities that encourage non-motorized transportation. However, while the NMTP is an important start, it is ultimately futile without the needed resources for implementation. The NMTP goals include:

 Increased bicycle and pedestrian access - Expand bicycle and pedestrian facilities and access within and between neighborhoods, to



employment centers, shopping areas, schools, and recreational sites.

- Increased travel by cycling and walking Make the bicycle and walking an integral part of daily life in San Bernardino County, particularly (for bicycle) for trips of less than five miles, by implementing and maintaining a bikeway network, providing end-of-trip facilities, improving bicycle/transit integration, encouraging bicycle use, and making bicycling safer and more convenient.
- Routine accommodation in transportation and land use planning Routinely consider bicyclists and pedestrians in the planning and design of land development, roadway, transit, and other transportation facilities, as appropriate to the context of each facility and its surroundings.
- Improved bicycle and pedestrian safety Encourage local and statewide policies and practices that improve bicycle and pedestrian safety.
- Identify achievable opportunities for deployment of complete streets strategies in a way that recognizes the diversity of urban and rural contexts in San Bernardino County.

Assembly Bill (AB) 1358 requires consideration of complete streets with any substantive revision to general plan circulation elements. Known as the Complete Streets Act of 2008, AB 1358 was developed to assist in the reduction of GHG emissions in California as outlined in the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006. The circulation element must plan for a balanced, multimodal transportation network that meets the needs of all users of streets, roads and highways.

Complete streets are designed and operated to enable safe access for all users, including pedestrians, bicyclists, motorists and transit riders of all ages and abilities. SANBAG is preparing a Complete Streets Strategy to assist local jurisdictions in implementing complete streets policies and projects.

As a coordinated component of the NMTP, SANBAG is developing a Safe Routes to School (SRTS) Inventory to assist local jurisdictions in addressing SCS objectives through the coordinated development of implementable active transportation strategies.

# Additional Notes on Bicycles

San Bernardino County has experienced a substantial growth in the non-motorized system during the past decade. In a thirteen year span, the centerline miles of bicycle infrastructure countywide has significantly increased from 53 miles in 2001 to 494 miles in 2014 (refer to **Table II-6**). This represents an eight-fold growth in the County's bicycle infrastructure. Bicycle classes as identified in the table include the following:

- Class I (Share Use or Bike Path): A bikeway physically separated from any street or highway. Shared Use Paths may also be used by pedestrians, skaters, wheelchair users, joggers, and other non-motorized users.
- Class II (Bike Lane): A portion of roadway that has been designated by striping, signaling, and pavement markings for the preferential or exclusive use of bicyclists.



• Class III (Bike Route): Any road, street, path, or way that in some manner is specifically designated for bicycle travel regardless of whether such facilities are designated for the exclusive use of bicycles, or are to be shared with other transportation modes.

The County has several Class I facilities in place for both commuting and recreation such as the Pacific Electric Trail, Santa Ana River Trail, Orange Blossom Trail and the Route 66 Heritage Trail. SANBAG member jurisdictions have continued to extend existing routes and propose new bicycle infrastructure as both population and demand has grown.

| Existing Path Miles by Class Planned Path Miles by Class |         |          |     |       |        |            |     |       |            |
|--|---------|----------|-----|-------|--------|------------|-----|-------|------------|
|  | Existin | g Path N |     |       | Planne | ed Path IV |     |       | Total Path |
| City   |         |          | III | Total |        |            | III | Total | Miles      |
| Adelanto   | 0       | 0        | 0   | 0     | 0      | 5          | 0   | 5     | 5          |
| Apple Valley   | 11      | 22       | 0   | 33    | 46     | 54         | 14  | 115   | 148        |
| Barstow  | 0       | 0        | 0   | 0     | 0      | 37         | 0   | 37    | 37         |
| Big Bear Lake  | 0       | 0        | 10  | 10    | 11     | 41         | 10  | 62    | 72         |
| Chino  | 3       | 22       | 3   | 28    | 21     | 32         | 0   | 53    | 80         |
| Chino Hills  | 0       | 22       | 0   | 22    | 0      | 8          | 5   | 12    | 34         |
| Colton   | 7       | 6        | 14  | 27    | 0      | 18         | 2   | 20    | 47         |
| Fontana  | 13      | 28       | 1   | 42    | 22     | 68         | 10  | 99    | 141        |
| Grand Terrace  | 0       | 3        | 1   | 4     | 2      | 5          | 0   | 7     | 10         |
| Hesperia   | 3       | 33       | 0   | 36    | 28     | 75         | 15  | 118   | 153        |
| Highland   | 0       | 16       | 0   | 16    | 5      | 20         | 2   | 28    | 44         |
| Loma Linda   | 6       | 10       | 0   | 16    | 0      | 4          | 0   | 4     | 20         |
| Montclair  | 1       | 2        | 0   | 3     | 0      | 7          | 0   | 7     | 10         |
| Needles  | 0       | 0        | 0   | 0     | 1      | 2          | 0   | 3     | 3          |
| Ontario  | 2       | 2        | 0   | 5     | 41     | 44         | 29  | 114   | 119        |
| Rancho Cucamonga   | 14      | 59       | 40  | 113   | 15     | 58         | 15  | 88    | 202        |
| Redlands   | 1       | 0        | 0   | 1     | 25     | 76         | 35  | 136   | 137        |
| Rialto   | 2       | 10       | 0   | 12    | 3      | 35         | 9   | 47    | 59         |
| San Bernardino   | 3       | 15       | 0   | 17    | 45     | 58         | 1   | 104   | 121        |
| SANBAG   | 0       | 0        | 0   | 0     | 10     | 0          | 0   | 10    | 10         |
| Twentynine Palms   | 7       | 6        | 0   | 14    | 6      | 17         | 0   | 23    | 36         |
| Unincorporated   | 9       | 0        | 4   | 14    | 9      | 231        | 108 | 349   | 363        |
| Upland   | 6       | 22       | 12  | 40    | 2      | 17         | 0   | 19    | 59         |
| Victorville  | 1       | 0        | 0   | 1     | 21     | 69         | 4   | 94    | 94         |
| Үисаіра  | 2       | 17       | 0   | 19    | 0      | 29         | 0   | 29    | 49         |
| Yucca Valley   | 0       | 0        | 23  | 23    | 6      | 39         | 1   | 46    | 70         |
|  | 91      | 296      | 107 | 49    | 320    | 1,048      | 261 | 1,629 | 2,124      |

### Table II-6: City Bike Path Mileage by Class

Source: SANBAG

# Additional Notes on Pedestrians



Automobile travel is the predominant mode of transportation and as such has historically been the targeted user of transportation infrastructure. This has left pedestrians at a significant disadvantage when it comes to access and safety. In the years 2007 to 2011, pedestrians have been involved in nearly 2,300 vehicle involved collisions countywide. The result was 206 untimely deaths, 336 severe injuries that often plague the injured party for life, and 1,753 less serious injuries.

Improving pedestrian safety and access through more adequate transportation

infrastructure and inclusive land use is a high priority. Focus is currently on creating safe routes to schools and implementing SANBAG's award winning *Improvements to Transit Access for Cyclists and Pedestrians* Report (November 2012). Regional priorities for pedestrian planning include:

- Improving pedestrian access to transit
- Removing existing barriers to pedestrian travel
- Development of regional trails and pathways which provide improved pedestrian access to destinations
- Improvement of the pedestrian environment on major regional arterials and at regional activity centers

# **Travel Demand Management**

# Park and Ride Services

Park and ride facilities are located to encourage ridesharing, vanpooling and transit use by providing convenient access to transportation services. Park and ride facilities within San Bernardino County are free and generally publicly owned. Private park and ride lots exist, generally at churches where no overnight or weekend parking is allowed.



# **Rideshare Services**

SANBAG encourages commuters to carpool, vanpool, use public transit, cycle or walk to work by working directly with large and small employers to provide support to commuters that use alternative forms of transportation. SANBAG partners with the Riverside County Transportation Commission (RCTC) to provide rideshare program assistance through the IE Commuter Program. SANBAG is currently

pursuing expansion of regional vanpool services to cover additional areas of San Bernardino County. A vanpool program currently exists for the Victor Valley.



# Inland Empire 511 Motorist Aid Traveler Information System

SANBAG partners with RCTC to maintain a free traveler information service that provides transit and commuter service information via the web (www.IE511.org) or a toll-free number (1-877-MY-IE511). The system was launched in April 2010 and provides robust, up to the minute traffic and mobility options to travelers. The 511 service helps commuters avoid delays, identify freeway closures, and identify alternative transportation options such as transit and ridesharing. The service also improves overall traffic congestion, mobility and quality of life.





# Call Boxes/Freeway Service Patrol

As the Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies (SAFE) for San Bernardino County, SANBAG operates an array of freeway services to provide assistance to motorists. SANBAG maintains approximately 1,300 call boxes along most State, Interstate and US Highways assisting over 1.6 million motorists since 1990. In 2006 Freeway Service Patrols (FSP) were initiated to provide roving tow truck assistance on select urban freeways during peak commute periods.

# **III. Financial Forecast**

# Background

An extension of the Measure I half-cent sales tax for transportation was passed by the voters of San Bernardino County in November 2004, and revenue collection began in April 2010. The Measure I Expenditure Plan, adopted as part of the Measure I extension, delineates how this funding is to be distributed by geographic subarea and program. **Figure III-1** shows the last 10 years of countywide Measure I revenue, from Fiscal Year 2003/2004 through 2013/2014. The revenue tends to follow economic cycles, from the robust growth in the mid-2000s, to the severe downturn in 2009-2012, to the current cycle of recovery.



Figure III-1: Measure I Historical Revenue

The Measure I 2010-2040 Strategic Plan was adopted by the SANBAG Board in April 2009 to further develop the policy framework by which the allocation of Measure I funds would occur, through 2040. The Strategic Plan also required the development of a Ten-Year Delivery Plan, to be periodically updated. The purpose of the Ten-Year Delivery Plan is to provide a list of Measure I projects to be developed and funded during each subsequent ten-year window of time and to define the scope, schedule and budget for these projects. The Delivery Plan establishes a common understanding among members of the SANBAG Board, staff, member agencies and citizens of San Bernardino County, setting a baseline upon which commitments of revenues, project costs, scopes and schedules are measured. The Delivery Plan is updated every two years with more current information.

The Measure I Strategic Plan structures funding programs and policies to ensure that revenues are expended in a way that is consistent with voter intent. The Strategic Plan includes policies on how revenue is to be invested within each of the Measure I Subareas and programs. Measure I has a return-to-source provision stating that funds will be allocated to subareas in accordance with the actual sales tax revenue collected in each subarea. Based on revenue projections, the Expenditure Plan estimated

Measure I funds to be allocated among the subareas and the Cajon Pass as noted in **Figure III-2**. However, these percentages change over time based on the growth rates in taxable sales by subarea.

When the initial Measure I 2010-2040 Expenditure Plan revenue estimates were prepared in 2004, it was anticipated that approximately \$6 billion (in 2004 dollars) would be collected to support

transportation projects throughout the County through 2040. In 2006, the SANBAG Board adopted \$8 billion as the Measure I revenue forecast. In 2008. the forecast was reassessed and projected to be \$7.25 billion. However, revenue dropped dramatically during the recession (refer to Figure III-1), and forecasts have been adjusted downward to \$5.4 billion (2013 dollars). Based on the infrastructure investment commitments defined in the Delivery Plan, the focus of the Countywide Transportation Plan is to evaluate anticipated



revenue for transportation through the life of Measure I and identify appropriate uses of that revenue.

# **Baseline and Aggressive Scenario Revenue Forecasts**

Two revenue forecasts were identified in the CTP, one corresponding to the Baseline Scenario and one corresponding to the Aggressive Scenario, as will be further described in Section IV. The Baseline Scenario assumes traditionally available funding sources, while the Aggressive Scenario assumes the additional increment of funding projected in SCAG's "financially constrained" scenario in the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS.

The initial step in developing the Baseline financial forecast was to evaluate the assumptions included in the Delivery Plan and extend those revenue assumptions from 2023 out to 2040. State and Federal funding continues to be an important component in the delivery of Measure I projects. However, the purchasing power of State and Federal funding has been steadily declining over the past twenty years. In California, through the mid-1990's, State and Federal transportation revenues accounted for almost 75% of total transportation funding. However, less than ten years later, that share has dropped to approximately 51%. The availability of State funding is highlighted by the decline in purchasing power of the state excise tax on gas from 1990 to 2014 (refer to **Figure III-3**) The Expenditure Plan estimates a proportional share of State and Federal funds to be distributed among the subareas.

For consistency purposes, State and Federal revenue streams have been assumed to remain flat (i.e. no increases or reductions in funding from current levels) after completion of the Delivery Plan through the life of Measure I. **Table III-1** presents Federal, State and local revenue forecasts in 2014 dollars that are projected to be available subsequent to delivery of projects in the Delivery Plan. The funding scenario also assumes delivery of express lanes on I-10 and I-15, along with the associated toll revenues. This

Financial Forecast 2015

Figure III-3: Decline in State Gas Tax Purchasing Power

Inflation Adjusted

revenue will be the basis of determining transportation investments beyond those projects committed in the Ten-Year Delivery Plan.

**Table III-2** identifies the various projects included in the Delivery Plan. The Delivery Plan forecasts Measure I revenue during the Delivery Plan timeframe, i.e. 2013 – 2023, to be approximately \$1.6 billion. It is estimated another \$950 million would be available from Federal funds and \$1.5 billion available from State revenue sources during the Delivery Plan timeframe.

Estimated Development Impact Fee (DIF) funds are not presented in Table III-1, but are



Source: Caltrans

2

0

Nominal

assumed to be available at the levels necessary to match SANBAG shares per the Nexus Study. Based on the most recent 2013 Nexus Study cost estimates, approximately \$2.0 billion in DIF funds are anticipated to be collected during the life of Measure I for arterial, grade separation and interchanges projects.

The revenue for the Valley Freeway Interchange Program is what would be available in uncommitted interchange funds following completion of the top ten interchanges on the priority list, plus I-10/Pepper. The grade separation portion of the Valley Major Street Program has no additional Measure I revenue beyond the Ten-Year Delivery Plan under current projections.

Approximately \$2.0 billion in Development Impact Fees funds are anticipated to be collected during the life of Measure I

Inflation and Mileage Adjusted

The Valley Major Street Arterial Program is not shown, as jurisdictions have access to a formula share of the revenues available to that program under the "Equitable Share" policy. Local jurisdictions decide which of their Nexus Study projects to fund in any given year. None of the estimates for the Measure I Local Street pass-through or Senior and Disabled Transit programs are shown, given the generally formula-based nature of these ongoing programs. Only the Major Local Highways Program funding is shown for the Mountain/Desert subareas. The Delivery Plan shows substantial commitments of those funds for the Victor Valley, although \$84 million in funds are projected for additional projects through 2040. The other Mountain/Desert subareas have relatively small commitments of Measure I Major Local Highways funding in the Delivery Plan.

To facilitate implementation of active transportation infrastructure, in March 2015, the SANBAG Board of Directors approved amendments to several Measure I Strategic Plan Policies (40003, 40006, 40012 and 40016). Text was added to note that 'construction or maintenance of off-roadway bicycle facilities that benefit roadway safety or traffic flow is an allowable expense of Measure I arterial funds.

|   | Uncommitted Revenue Beyond<br>Ten-Year Delivery Plan |
|---|--|
| Revenue Source  | (thousands of 2014 dollars)                          |
| Measure I Programs  |  |
| Valley Freeway  | \$123,000  |
| Valley Freeway Interchanges   | \$134,000  |
| Valley Major Streets - Grade Separations  | \$0  |
| Valley Metrolink/Rail Capital   | \$17,000   |
| Valley Express Bus/BRT Capital and Operations                                   | \$149,000  |
| Cajon Pass  | \$56,000   |
| Victor Valley Major Local Highways  | \$84,000   |
| North Desert Major Local Highways   | \$34,000   |
| Mountains Major Local Highways  | \$18,000   |
| Morongo Basin Major Local Highways  | \$24,000   |
| Colorado River Major Local Highways   | \$3,000  |
| Federal   |  |
| Congestion Management Air Quality Valley  | \$171,000  |
| Congestion Management Air Quality Mountain/Desert                               | \$134,000  |
| Surface Transportation Program Valley   | \$130,000  |
| Surface Transportation Program Mountain/Desert                                  | \$42,000   |
| FTA Section 5307  | \$89,000   |
| State   |  |
| State Transit Assistance Fund Valley  | \$66,000   |
| State Transit Assistance Fund Mountain/Desert                                   | \$61,000   |
| Regional Improvement Program (aka STIP) Valley                                  | \$80,000   |
| Regional Improvement Program (aka STIP) Mountain/Desert<br>Source: SANBAG, 2014 | \$220,000  |

Table III-1: Estimate of Uncommitted Revenue Beyond the Ten-Year Delivery Plan

Source: SANBAG, 2014

Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ), Surface Transportation Program (STP) and State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) funding is estimated only for the Valley and overall Mountain/Desert areas. It is worth noting that the amount of uncommitted State and Federal funding (approximately \$1 billion) is much larger than the uncommitted Measure I, in part because substantial bonding against Measure I is projected by the Delivery Plan to occur to deliver the projects at an early date. The debt service for this bonding is considered to be committed revenue in the Delivery Plan. This means that additional State and Federal funding for capital projects will be freed up following the delivery of the Delivery Plan projects, as such funding can only be used concurrent with project delivery.

Operating and maintenance costs are always a concern as highway maintenance and transit operations funding typically lags behind actual needs. Local jurisdictions have become increasingly concerned that future maintenance funding will be insufficient to cover basic maintenance requirements. With regards to transit operations, SANBAG currently forecasts that highway maintenance and transit operating obligations under the Baseline Scenario can marginally survive with modest annual increases in operating costs and conservative estimates of future State and Federal revenue. However, this means that highway pavements will not keep up with performance standards, and transit expansion beyond the Ten-Year Delivery Plan will be minimal.

| Table III-2: Ten-Year Delivery Plan Projects | Table III-2: | Ten-Year | Delivery | Plan P | rojects |
|--|--------------|----------|----------|--------|---------|
|--|--------------|----------|----------|--------|---------|

| Measure I Programs   |                                   |  |  |  |  |
|--|-----------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Cajon Pass Subarea Program   |                                   |  |  |  |  |
| I-15/I-215 (Devore) Interchange                                    |                                   |  |  |  |  |
| San Bernardino Valley Freeway Program                              |                                   |  |  |  |  |
| I-10 Widening (HOV or Express Lanes) from LA                       | County Line to Ford Street        |  |  |  |  |
| I-15 Express Lanes from Riverside County Line                      | to I-215                          |  |  |  |  |
| I-215 Widening from Riverside County Line to                       | I-10                              |  |  |  |  |
| I-10 Truck Climbing Lane from Live Oak to Rive                     | erside County Line                |  |  |  |  |
| SR-210 Widening from Highland Avenue to I-1                        | 0                                 |  |  |  |  |
| San Bernardino Valley Freeway Interchange Prog                     | ram                               |  |  |  |  |
| I-10/Cherry Avenue   | I-10/Alabama Street               |  |  |  |  |
| I-10/Citrus Avenue   | I-15/Baseline Road                |  |  |  |  |
| I-10/Tippecanoe Avenue Phase 1 & 2                                 | I-10/Mount Vernon Avenue          |  |  |  |  |
| I-10/Cedar Avenue  | SR-60/Archibald Avenue            |  |  |  |  |
| SR-210/Baseline Road   | I-10/Monte Vista Avenue           |  |  |  |  |
| SR-60/Central Avenue   | I-10/Pepper Avenue Phase 2        |  |  |  |  |
| I-10/University Avenue   | I-10/Riverside Avenue Phase 2     |  |  |  |  |
| I-215/University Parkway   |                                   |  |  |  |  |
| San Bernardino Valley Major Street Program                         |                                   |  |  |  |  |
| North Vineyard Avenue Grade Separation (Union Pacific)             |                                   |  |  |  |  |
| South Milliken Avenue Grade Separation (Union Pacific)             |                                   |  |  |  |  |
| Glen Helen Parkway Grade Separation (Burlington Northern-Santa Fe) |                                   |  |  |  |  |
| Palm Avenue Grade Separation (Burlington No                        | orthern-Santa Fe)                 |  |  |  |  |
| Laurel Avenue Grade Separation (Burlington N                       | Iorthern-Santa Fe)                |  |  |  |  |
| San Bernardino Valley Metrolink/Passenger Rail Program             |                                   |  |  |  |  |
| Downtown San Bernardino Rail                                       |                                   |  |  |  |  |
| Redlands Passenger Rail  |                                   |  |  |  |  |
| San Bernardino Line Double Track (Preliminary                      |                                   |  |  |  |  |
| Gold Line to Montclair (Environmental Docum                        | entation/Preliminary Engineering) |  |  |  |  |
| Valley Express Bus & Bus Rapid Transit Program                     |                                   |  |  |  |  |
| E Street Bus Rapid Transit   |                                   |  |  |  |  |
| Victor Valley Major Local Highway Program                          |                                   |  |  |  |  |
| Yucca Loma Corridor – Yucca Loma Bridge and                        | Yates Road                        |  |  |  |  |
| I-15/Ranchero Road Interchange                                     |                                   |  |  |  |  |
| Yucca Loma Corridor – Green Tree Boulevard Extension               |                                   |  |  |  |  |
| US-395 Widening from SR-18 to Chamberlaine                         | e Way                             |  |  |  |  |
| Ranchero Road Corridor   |                                   |  |  |  |  |
| North Desert Major Local Highway Program                           |                                   |  |  |  |  |
| Lenwood Road Grade Separation                                      |                                   |  |  |  |  |
| Source: SANBAG Measure I 2010-2040 Ten-Year Delivery Plan, March   | n 2014                            |  |  |  |  |

Financial Forecast 2015

The Federal Transportation Improvement Program (FTIP) is a listing of all capital transportation projects proposed over a six-year period for the SCAG region. The projects include highway improvements, transit, rail and bus facilities, high occupancy vehicle lanes, signal synchronization, intersection improvements, freeway ramps, etc. In the SCAG region, a biennial FTIP update is produced on an even-

The Federal Transportation Improvement Program includes projects totaling approximately \$6.5 Billion in San Bernardino County year cycle. The FTIP is prepared to implement projects and programs listed in the RTP/SCS and developed in compliance with state and federal requirements. County Transportation Commissions have the responsibility under State law to propose county projects, using the current RTP's policies, programs, and projects as a guide, from

among submittals by cities and local agencies. The current FTIP project list for San Bernardino County includes projects totaling approximately \$6.5 billion. Based on known local, State and Federal sources, all RTP projects (which includes the full FTIP project list) identified for San Bernardino County cannot be implemented with traditionally available resources.

The 2012 RTP/SCS financially constrained "Plan" alternative included approximately \$12 billion in capital improvement projects and \$12 billion in operations and maintenance (assuming year of expenditure dollars) for projects throughout San Bernardino County. This SCAG funding forecast is generally consistent with assumptions for the CTP Aggressive Scenario.

The SCAG RTP/SCS includes a set of innovative funding sources that go above and beyond the revenue projected from traditional funding sources. Innovative funding sources and new revenue sources included in the RTP/SCS are noted in **Table III-3**. The SANBAG Board has not endorsed the Aggressive Scenario revenue estimate, but it falls within FHWA's definition of reasonably foreseeable funding sources for purposes of the SCAG RTP/SCS. The State of California is pursuing a pilot study to test the feasibility of a mileage-based user fee or "road charge." This pilot study will help to inform SCAG and other agencies in the region regarding future revenue estimates.

| Revenue Source  | Total Anticipated<br>Revenue |
|---|------------------------------|
| Bond proceeds from local sales tax measures   | \$25.6 B                     |
| State and Federal gas excise tax adjustment to maintain historical purchasing power | \$16.9B                      |
| Mileage-based user fee  | \$110.3 B*                   |
| Highway tolls   | \$22.3 B                     |
| Private equity participation  | \$2.7B                       |
| Freight Fee/National Freight Program  | \$4.2 B                      |
| E-Commerce tax  | \$3.1B                       |
| State Bond Proceeds, Federal Grants, and Other for California High-Speed Rail       | \$33.0 B                     |
| Value capture strategies  | \$1.2B                       |

### Table III-3: New Revenue Sources and Innovative Financing Strategies for2012 RTP/SCS

Notes: \* Estimated incremental revenue only Source: SCAG 2012/2016 RTP/SCS

# IV. Future of the Subregion

San Bernardino County has experienced significant growth over the past few decades. Growth is expected to continue at a steady pace, placing added demands on the transportation system, water resources and other environmental resources. Section IV of the CTP examines future growth within the County and evaluates the demands that growth will place on the transportation system. It also addresses SANBAG's approach to sustainability issues.

Over 80% of the County's land is under federal or tribal control and unavailable for private development.

# **Growth Forecasts**

As stated earlier, San Bernardino County is geographically large – over 20,000 square miles. The other five counties in the SCAG region (Imperial, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, and Ventura) could all fit within San Bernardino County. However, over 80% of the County's land is under federal or tribal control and unavailable for private development.

San Bernardino County's population growth rate averaged 1.6% per year between 2000 and 2012. While this growth rate may not be sustained into the future, substantial growth is still expected throughout the county. A developable land analysis conducted by the County of San Bernardino reveals that only 15% of the county's land remains for private development, this still represents substantial development potential – more than twice the land area of all of Orange County (948 square miles). Countywide population is forecast to grow from 2,068,000 in 2012 to 2,791,000 by 2040, an increase of 32% representing an annual increase of 1.1% (refer to **Table IV-1**).

**Figure IV-1** presents the population density associated with new growth (i.e. excludes existing population) expected by 2040. This indicates that while the San Bernardino Valley continues to grow,

growth is also anticipated throughout the Victor Valley and other parts of the county. Employment is forecast to grow by 56% by 2040 representing an annual growth rate of 1.6%. Forecast employment growth exceeds population growth to correct for the high unemployment rate experienced during the recession. The aggressive employment growth forecast results in a 2040 unemployment rate that is closer to the

By 2040, countywide employment is forecast to increase by 56%

historical average and also assumes an increasing jobs/household ratio over time.

**Figure IV-2** presents the employment density for the growth in employment anticipated between 2012 and 2040. Evaluation of the population and employment growth trends provides the basis for understanding how mobility may be impacted by the forecast growth. Concentrations of population and employment growth in areas that currently experience congestion require careful consideration to ensure efficient mobility is provided for current and future transportation system users.

General indications of future infrastructure needs can be assessed through a review of **Figure IV-1** and **Figure IV-2**. While population growth is expected throughout the County, there are some key areas where particularly significant growth is expected. Notable areas that anticipate significant increases in population include southern Chino, the New Model Colony in southern Ontario, the northern parts of Fontana along I-15/SR-210, the western portion of Victorville and the Tapestry development in southern Hesperia. All of these areas will require further development of the arterial system, consideration of access to the freeway system as well as future transit service.
Continued growth in employment requires consideration of both highway and transit accessibility to jobs. While funding for transit infrastructure and service is limited, thoughtful land use planning can make it easier to invest in and operate multi-modal transportation options. Several key employment nodes are visible from **Figure IV-2**, including areas adjacent to the Ontario International Airport, Downtown San Bernardino and key freeway interchanges along the I-15 and I-10 corridors, among others.

| Jurisdiction<br>Adelanto<br>Apple Valley<br>Barstow<br>Big Bear Lake<br>Chino<br>Chino Hills | 2012<br>31,145<br>70,162<br>23,069<br>5,094<br>79,447<br>75,765 | 2040<br>69,977<br>100,558<br>35,108<br>6,915<br>120,394 | Growth<br>38,832<br>30,396<br>12,039<br>1,821 | %<br>Growth<br>124.7%<br>43.3%<br>52.2%<br>35.7% | 2012<br>3,885<br>15,417<br>8,135 | 2040<br>7,753<br>27,564<br>16,785 | Growth<br>3,868<br>12,147<br>8,650 | %<br>Growth<br>99.6%<br>78.8%<br>106.3% |
|--|---|---|---|--|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|
| Adelanto<br>Apple Valley<br>Barstow<br>Big Bear Lake<br>Chino                                | 31,145<br>70,162<br>23,069<br>5,094<br>79,447<br>75,765         | 69,977<br>100,558<br>35,108<br>6,915<br>120,394         | 38,832<br>30,396<br>12,039<br>1,821           | 124.7%<br>43.3%<br>52.2%                         | 3,885<br>15,417<br>8,135         | 7,753<br>27,564                   | 3,868<br>12,147                    | 99.6%<br>78.8%                          |
| Apple Valley<br>Barstow<br>Big Bear Lake<br>Chino  | 70,162<br>23,069<br>5,094<br>79,447<br>75,765                   | 100,558<br>35,108<br>6,915<br>120,394                   | 30,396<br>12,039<br>1,821                     | 43.3%<br>52.2%                                   | 15,417<br>8,135                  | 27,564                            | 12,147                             | 78.8%                                   |
| Barstow<br>Big Bear Lake<br>Chino  | 23,069<br>5,094<br>79,447<br>75,765                             | 35,108<br>6,915<br>120,394                              | 12,039<br>1,821                               | 52.2%  | 8,135                            |                                   |                                    |   |
| Big Bear Lake<br>Chino   | 5,094<br>79,447<br>75,765                                       | 6,915<br>120,394  | 1,821   |  |                                  | 16,785                            | 8 <i>,</i> 650                     | 106 3%                                  |
| Chino  | 79,447<br>75,765  | 120,394   |   | 35.7%  |                                  |                                   |                                    |   |
|  | 75,765  |   | 40 047  |  | 3,840                            | 5,400                             | 1,560                              | 40.6%                                   |
| Chino Hills  |   | 0/ 000  | 40,947  | 51.5%  | 42,580                           | 50,568                            | 7,988                              | 18.8%                                   |
| Chino Thiis  | F2 700  | 94,895  | 19,130  | 25.2%  | 11,471                           | 18,580                            | 7,109                              | 62.0%                                   |
| Colton   | 52,768  | 69,070  | 16,302  | 30.9%  | 16,826                           | 29,200                            | 12,374                             | 73.5%                                   |
| Fontana  | 200,228   | 280,867   | 80,639  | 40.3%  | 47,011                           | 70,815                            | 23,804                             | 50.6%                                   |
| Grand Terrace  | 12,200  | 14,170  | 1,970   | 16.1%  | 2,153                            | 5,341                             | 3,188                              | 148.1%                                  |
| Hesperia   | 91,122  | 129,054   | 37,932  | 41.6%  | 14,909                           | 28,343                            | 13,434                             | 90.1%                                   |
| Highland   | 53,739  | 66,878  | 13,139  | 24.4%  | 5,532                            | 10,206                            | 4,674                              | 84.5%                                   |
| Loma Linda   | 23,409  | 29,259  | 5,850   | 25.0%  | 16,665                           | 21,147                            | 4,482                              | 26.9%                                   |
| Montclair  | 37,198  | 42,749  | 5,551   | 14.9%  | 16,523                           | 19,017                            | 2,494                              | 15.1%                                   |
| Needles  | 4,898   | 7,030   | 2,132   | 43.5%  | 2,235                            | 3,790                             | 1,555                              | 69.6%                                   |
| Ontario  | 166,328   | 258,612   | 92,284  | 55.5%  | 103,312                          | 175,389                           | 72,077                             | 69.8%                                   |
| Rancho Cucamonga   | 170,104   | 204,346   | 34,242  | 20.1%  | 69,901                           | 104,620                           | 34,719                             | 49.7%                                   |
| Redlands   | 69,585  | 85,540  | 15,955  | 22.9%  | 31,732                           | 53,400                            | 21,668                             | 68.3%                                   |
| Rialto   | 100,836   | 111,980   | 11,144  | 11.1%  | 21,076                           | 30,529                            | 9,453                              | 44.9%                                   |
| San Bernardino (City)  | 211,943   | 257,410   | 45,467  | 21.5%  | 88,576                           | 128,624                           | 40,048                             | 45.2%                                   |
| Twentynine Palms   | 25,875  | 37,321  | 11,446  | 44.2%  | 4,336                            | 8,510                             | 4,174                              | 96.3%                                   |
| Upland   | 74,660  | 81,727  | 7,067   | 9.5%   | 31,684                           | 43,471                            | 11,787                             | 37.2%                                   |
| Victorville  | 119,595   | 184,545   | 64,950  | 54.3%  | 29,794                           | 52,700                            | 22,906                             | 76.9%                                   |
| Үисаіра  | 52,270  | 72,514  | 20,244  | 38.7%  | 8,160                            | 15,004                            | 6,844                              | 83.9%                                   |
| Yucca Valley   | 20,951  | 26,328  | 5,377   | 25.7%  | 6,053                            | 10,030                            | 3,977                              | 65.7%                                   |
| Unincorporated County  | 295,587   | 344,077   | 48,490  | 16.4%  | 57,357                           | 91,119                            | 33,762                             | 58.9%                                   |
| County 2,  | ,067,978  | 2,731,324   | 663,346                                       | 32.1%  | 659,163                          | 1,027,905                         | 368,742                            | 55.9%                                   |

#### Table IV-1: San Bernardino County Forecast Population and Employment Growth

Source: SANBAG, SCAG



#### Figure IV-1: Population Growth Density



#### Figure IV-2: Employment Growth Density

# **Sustainability**

SANBAG's CTP is built on a foundation of economic and environmental sustainability. It recognizes that mobility and smart land development are needed to sustain the economic growth and competitiveness necessary for survival within the global economy. This economic growth is needed, in turn, to fund the array of statewide and regional sustainability commitments. San Bernardino County must invest in all modes of transportation, including highways, to support its businesses and growing population. Although SANBAG and its partners are aggressively pursuing sustainable



approaches to transportation and land use, in support of SB 375, capacity enhancements to the system will still be needed.

It must also be recognized that many of these sustainability concerns are interconnected. Without economic sustainability, environmental sustainability is more difficult to achieve. Jurisdiction staff must devote themselves to maintaining core functions and may not have all the resources needed to focus on environmental sustainability goals. Yet environmental and energy issues could have long term implications on economic sustainability. Economic, energy, and environmental sustainability must be approached holistically, understanding these inter-dependencies.

The analysis conducted by Caltrans for the California Transportation Plan has indicated that the key to meeting GHG reduction goals will involve transformation of the passenger vehicle and freight transportation fleets. While VMT reductions through transit and land use strategies and TDM initiatives will contribute, the most dramatic reductions will come from vehicle and fuel technology improvements. That said, SANBAG and its partner agencies are aggressively pursuing rail and bus transit improvements and strongly encouraging TOD by local jurisdictions with transit stops/stations along those facilities. The emphasis on Active Transportation, TDM and TSM continues, as well as non-transportation initiatives such as the countywide GHG reduction plan and habitat conservation.

Overall, the following specific sustainability activities could be considered SANBAG focus areas, in partnership with transit agencies and local jurisdictions:

- 1. Expansion of the transit network
- 2. Facilitation of transit oriented development
- 3. Implementation of the Non-Motorized Transportation Plan
- 4. Development of a habitat preservation/conservation framework
- 5. Implementation assistance to local jurisdictions in response to the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan
- 6. Development of a "complete streets" and Safe Routes to School Strategy
- 7. Continuation of the Home Energy Renovation Opportunity (HERO) Program and alternative energy programs
- 8. Facilitation of truck retrofit programs for San Bernardino County businesses
- 9. Facilitation of Plug-in Electric Vehicle (PEV) installations countywide

Future of the Subregion **2015** 

The discussion below provides a snapshot of some of SANBAG's sustainability initiatives.

#### Sustainability MOU with SCAG

SANBAG and SCAG reached a milestone on the path toward sustainability when the joint sustainability Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) was approved by both agencies: by SANBAG in November 2013 and SCAG in February 2014. The MOU identifies 16 specific initiatives on which both agencies can focus as we jointly seek to develop a more sustainable San Bernardino County and Southern California region.

Most of the initiatives are directly supportive of SB 375 goals, but some are focused on the broader goals of GHG reduction strategies outlined in AB32. Some of these initiatives are described in more detail below. The MOU can be accessed at http://www.sanbag.ca.gov/planning2/plan\_county-wide-transit.html.

#### The San Bernardino Countywide Vision

Well before the joint SANBAG/SCAG sustainability MOU was approved, SANBAG, the County of San Bernardino, and our other local jurisdiction and regional partners were taking steps to develop a more sustainable county. The Countywide Vision Statement, approved by the County of San Bernardino and all 24 cities in the County in 2011, was a bold step, setting the County on a sustainable course for nine distinct sectors or elements. In fact, one of the core principles of the Vision states:

"We envision a sustainable system of high-quality education, community health, public safety, housing, retail, recreation, arts and culture, and infrastructure, in which development complements our natural resources and environment."

Subsequent to the 2011 approval of the Vision Statement, progress has been made, to varying degrees,

on the nine vision elements: jobs/economy, education, environment, wellness, housing, infrastructure, public safety, quality of life, and image. The focus of this transportation strategy is on sustainability issues that fall within the domain of SANBAG in its role as Council of Governments (COG), County Transportation Commission (CTC), or County Transportation Authority (CTA). The goal is to better define a realistic set of paths forward on the sustainability fronts where SANBAG has a role.

#### **Development of a Habitat Preservation/Conservation Framework**

SANBAG is involved with habitat conservation principally as part of its efforts to mitigate its own transportation projects. For example, the Etiwanda Preserve (County Service Area 120) was established through the mitigation for the SR-210 Freeway, constructed in the late 1990s and early 2000s. Recently, SANBAG, in partnership with the County, led a study to develop a countywide habitat





# **IV-6** Countywide Transportation Plan - FINAL

preservation/conservation framework. The purpose was to explore opportunities for more comprehensive approaches to habitat preservation/conservation than the project-by-project mitigation that has generally been the case in the past. The intent is a win-win scenario in which conservation objectives are achieved while also streamlining the environmental approvals for development projects. The effort is guided by the Environment Element group, established as a multi-disciplinary team representing both public and private stakeholders. The next steps will involve development of an inventory and tracking system and completion of a conservation gap analysis.

## *Implementation Assistance to Local Jurisdictions in Response to the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan*

SANBAG is leading a project entitled Development of Climate Action Plan (CAP) Implementation Tools. The intent of this effort is to assist local jurisdictions in implementing their own city-level Climate Action Plans based on the results of the now complete Regional Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan and EIR. The project is providing CAP implementation templates, development screening tools, and guidelines for administration and maintenance of the CAPs, substantially simplifying the next steps for CAP implementation. Future efforts may be required to update CAPs based on actions of the State related to AB 32, and SANBAG may have a continuing role to provide assistance, if the cities view this to be in their interest.

# Home Energy Renovation Opportunity (HERO) Program and Alternative Energy Programs

The HERO Program began in 2013, and provides financing opportunities to encourage installation of energy efficiency improvements, distributed generation, renewable energy sources, water efficiency improvements, and electric vehicle charging infrastructure for residential and commercial property owners. SANBAG has partnered with Renovate America, Inc.



and SAMAS Capital to make HERO available to all participating cities and the County. The HERO Program is also an economic development program helping to create local jobs, save money, increase property values and lower GHG emissions.

SANBAG is also proceeding in 2014 with solar power initiatives in partnership with interested cities and other public entities. Participation may be through either power purchase agreements or financing of solar installations on public buildings. SANBAG's involvement in both the HERO program and the solar

power initiatives represent implementation strategies for GHG reduction commitments of local jurisdictions through their climate action plans.

# Truck Retrofit Programs for San Bernardino County Businesses

SANBAG received two grants in 2009, one under the Department of Energy Clean Cities' Petroleum Reduction Technologies Projects for the Transportation Sector and a matching grant from the California Energy Commission to convert over 200



Ryder tractor/trailer trucks to natural gas, construct two natural gas fueling stations, improve maintenance facilities, and provide training. The grants totaled \$36.3 million and were combined with Ryder corporate contributions to carry out the conversions.

Based on this successful venture, SANBAG could seek additional opportunities for truck retrofit projects, as grant opportunities arise. Grant opportunities may include federal, state, and regional sources. However, SANBAG need only become involved where other entities are not in a position to do so. Since 2009 the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) has awarded more than \$225 million in state Proposition 1B funds to help replace or retrofit more than 4,500 older diesel trucks. Last year, SCAQMD targeted outreach to smaller fleets with three or fewer trucks that will need to meet new California regulations that take effect in 2015. The availability of Proposition 1B funding is coming to an end, and other grant opportunities will need to be pursued. SANBAG may have a role as a partner with federal, state, or regional agencies to facilitate truck retrofit or conversions. Part of the rationale for SANBAG involvement is the need to attain air quality standards for PM 2.5 and ozone, which must be demonstrated through the SCAQMD Air Quality Management Plan and the State Implementation Plan (SIP) for air quality.

### Plug-in Electric Vehicle (PEV) Installations Countywide

The SCAG Electric Vehicle Program has recently released the Regional Electric Vehicle Readiness Plan (Plan). A copy of the Plan is available at http://www.scag.ca.gov/programs/Pages/PEVReadin essPlan.aspx.

A recent presentation by SCAG staff reviewed key findings relevant to the SANBAG region and ways in which local jurisdictions can begin to lay the

which local jurisdictions can begin to lay the foundation for an electric vehicle charging network. SANBAG can play a role in facilitating PEV charging station implementation by local jurisdictions at key locations and by addition of charging stations at locations for which we have direct or indirect responsibility. Substantial grant opportunities exist for PEV charging stations.

# SANBAG's Role in Sustainability

It is not SANBAG's intent to take over local jurisdiction responsibilities but to collaboratively determine with them how to move the sustainability agenda forward in an achievable way and in a way that will also promote the goals of the Countywide Vision and CTP. Overall, the following sustainability roles could be envisioned for SANBAG:

- 1. Implement the sustainability activities in the SANBAG/SCAG MOU. Note that these activities focus on environmental and energy sustainability, which includes partnering with local jurisdictions on sustainable land use strategies.
- 2. Facilitate the implementation of sustainability goals through collaborative efforts with the local jurisdictions and transit agencies.
- 3. Pursue grant funding to accelerate implementation of sustainability activities, where possible.
- 4. Monitor countywide progress on sustainability activities.



### Impacts of Growth on System Performance

Future transportation demands will take a toll on our infrastructure, absent significant investments. **Table IV-2** presents the growth in regional person trips anticipated based on forecast population and employment growth. Trips between San Bernadino and neighboring counties will continue to increase as demonstrated in **Table IV-2**. **Figure IV-3** demonstrates graphically the forecast interaction with adjacent counties. San Bernardino residents commuting to jobs in Orange and Los Angeles Counties will continue to strain key transportation corridors.

Transportation modeling shows that future growth will result in breakdowns in the countywide transportation system. A "No Build" future year 2040 scenario was modeled that assumes no improvements in the transportation system while accounting for future population and employment growth. While this is not necessarily a realistic scenario, as infrastructure projetcs will be implemented, this No Build scenario provides a snapshot of how growth could impact the county if nothing were to be done and identifies where the needs might be the greatest.

**Table IV-3** presents forecast 2040 No Build systemwide statistics with a comparison to base year 2012 performance. The comparisons show a significant degradation in performance, particularly with respect to delay and average facility speeds. Freeway speeds are forecast to deteriorate by over 15% from current levels. Drivers are forecast to experience an increase in delay of over 200%.

**Figure IV-4** presents a comparison of daily traffic volume growth between existing and 2040 No Build conditions. The width of the band is proportional to the growth in volume. As would be expected, freeways have the most substantial volume growth, but there are increases on arterials throughout the network.

**Figure IV-5** and **Figure IV-6** present A.M. and P.M. peak period congestion, respectively, in 2040 due to the growth in population and employment throughout the county. As depicted in **Figure IV-5** and **Figure IV-6** growth is anticipated to strain the efficiency of most freeways, absent capacity enhancements or other improvements to manage traffic demand or operations. The figures highlight the need for local and regional improvements to serve future transportation demands.

Future of the Subregion **2015** 

|                | Table IV-2: Forecast 2040 County to County Person Trip Growth |             |            |           |            |           |            |  |
|----------------|---|-------------|------------|-----------|------------|-----------|------------|--|
| County         | Imperial  | Los Angeles | Orange     | Riverside | Bernardino | Ventura   | Total      |  |
| 2012           |   |             |            |           |            |           |            |  |
| Imperial       | 456,319   | 1,478       | 591        | 6,428     | 1,759      | 146       | 466,720    |  |
| Los Angeles    | 4,809   | 31,248,637  | 1,068,155  | 114,284   | 459,320    | 328,511   | 33,223,715 |  |
| Orange         | 1,761   | 1,058,990   | 9,770,095  | 107,584   | 104,355    | 17,240    | 11,060,024 |  |
| Riverside      | 15,966  | 231,067     | 245,424    | 5,612,207 | 475,334    | 9,592     | 6,589,589  |  |
| San Bernardino | 4,690   | 566,391     | 181,417    | 394,392   | 5,267,053  | 12,220    | 6,426,162  |  |
| Ventura        | 803   | 374,406     | 19,790     | 5,088     | 12,729     | 2,353,590 | 2,766,407  |  |
| Total          | 484,347   | 33,480,968  | 11,285,471 | 6,239,982 | 6,320,550  | 2,721,299 | 60,532,616 |  |
|                |   |             | 2040 No    | Build     |            |           |            |  |
| Imperial       | 837,149   | 3,382       | 1,108      | 20,646    | 2,900      | 261       | 865,446    |  |
| Los Angeles    | 2,589   | 36,058,397  | 1,155,061  | 106,296   | 483,351    | 314,940   | 38,120,634 |  |
| Orange         | 854   | 1,109,540   | 10,886,996 | 89,821    | 89,686     | 13,808    | 12,190,706 |  |
| Riverside      | 24,038  | 364,302     | 403,182    | 9,121,849 | 680,593    | 13,394    | 10,607,359 |  |
| San Bernardino | 4,728   | 721,042     | 233,439    | 590,360   | 7,529,680  | 13,558    | 9,092,807  |  |
| Ventura        | 540   | 498,503     | 26,781     | 5,518     | 13,527     | 2,786,240 | 3,331,108  |  |
| Total          | 869,899   | 38,755,166  | 12,706,566 | 9,934,489 | 8,799,737  | 3,142,202 | 74,208,059 |  |
|                |   |             | Differe    | nce       |            |           |            |  |
| Imperial       | 380,830   | 1,904       | 517        | 14,218    | 1,141      | 115       | 398,726    |  |
| Los Angeles    | -2,220  | 4,809,760   | 86,906     | -7,988    | 24,031     | -13,571   | 4,896,919  |  |
| Orange         | -907  | 50,550      | 1,116,901  | -17,763   | -14,669    | -3,432    | 1,130,682  |  |
| Riverside      | 8,072   | 133,235     | 157,758    | 3,509,642 | 205,259    | 3,802     | 4,017,770  |  |
| San Bernardino | 38  | 154,651     | 52,022     | 195,968   | 2,262,627  | 1,338     | 2,666,645  |  |
| Ventura        | -263  | 124,097     | 6,991      | 430       | 798        | 432,650   | 564,701    |  |
| Total          | 385,552   | 5,274,198   | 1,421,095  | 3,694,507 | 2,479,187  | 420,903   | 13,675,443 |  |
|                | % Difference  |             |            |           |            |           |            |  |
| Imperial       | 83.5%   | 128.8%      | 87.5%      | 221.2%    | 64.9%      | 78.9%     | 85.4%      |  |
| Los Angeles    | -46.2%  | 15.4%       | 8.1%       | -7.0%     | 5.2%       | -4.1%     | 14.7%      |  |
| Orange         | -51.5%  | 4.8%        | 11.4%      | -16.5%    | -14.1%     | -19.9%    | 10.2%      |  |
| Riverside      | 50.6%   | 57.7%       | 64.3%      | 62.5%     | 43.2%      | 39.6%     | 61.0%      |  |
| San Bernardino | 0.8%  | 27.3%       | 28.7%      | 49.7%     | 43.0%      | 10.9%     | 41.5%      |  |
| Ventura        | -32.7%  | 33.1%       | 35.3%      | 8.4%      | 6.3%       | 18.4%     | 20.4%      |  |
| Total          | 79.6%   | 15.8%       | 12.6%      | 59.2%     | 39.2%      | 15.5%     | 22.6%      |  |

#### Table IV-2: Forecast 2040 County to County Person Trip Growth

Source: SBTAM



Figure IV-3: San Bernardino County Person Trip Distribution

Source: SBTAM

|                    | Vehicle Miles | Vehicle Hours | Vehicle Hours | Average |  |  |  |  |
|--------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------|--|--|--|--|
| Facility Type      | Traveled      | Traveled      | of Delay      | Speed   |  |  |  |  |
| 2012               |               |               |               |         |  |  |  |  |
| Freeways           | 36,660,567    | 639,479       | 68,112        | 57.3    |  |  |  |  |
| Principal Arterial | 7,888,090     | 221,647       | 41,084        | 35.6    |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Arterial     | 8,108,461     | 226,534       | 23,336        | 35.8    |  |  |  |  |
| Collector          | 3,805,711     | 115,763       | 8,450         | 32.9    |  |  |  |  |
| Total              | 56,462,829    | 1,203,423     | 140,982       | 46.9    |  |  |  |  |
| 2040 No Build      |               |               |               |         |  |  |  |  |
| Freeways           | 50,402,741    | 1,043,912     | 260,584       | 48.3    |  |  |  |  |
| Principal Arterial | 11,181,247    | 362,562       | 106,409       | 30.8    |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Arterial     | 12,865,940    | 398,300       | 73,156        | 32.3    |  |  |  |  |
| Collector          | 6,672,082     | 224,469       | 36,080        | 29.7    |  |  |  |  |
| Total              | 81,122,010    | 2,029,243     | 476,229       | 40.0    |  |  |  |  |
|                    |               | Difference    |               |         |  |  |  |  |
| Freeways           | 13,742,174    | 404,433       | 192,472       | -9.0    |  |  |  |  |
| Principal Arterial | 3,293,157     | 140,915       | 65,325        | -4.7    |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Arterial     | 4,757,479     | 171,766       | 49,820        | -3.5    |  |  |  |  |
| Collector          | 2,866,371     | 108,706       | 27,630        | -3.2    |  |  |  |  |
| Total              | 24,659,181    | 825,820       | 335,247       | -6.9    |  |  |  |  |
| % Difference       |               |               |               |         |  |  |  |  |
| Freeways           | 37.5%         | 63.2%         | 282.6%        | -15.8%  |  |  |  |  |
| Principal Arterial | 41.7%         | 63.6%         | 159.0%        | -13.3%  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Arterial     | 58.7%         | 75.8%         | 213.5%        | -9.8%   |  |  |  |  |
| Collector          | 75.3%         | 93.9%         | 327.0%        | -9.6%   |  |  |  |  |
| Total              | 43.7%         | 68.6%         | 237.8%        | -14.8%  |  |  |  |  |

#### Table IV-3: Forecast 2040 San Bernardino County Performance Statistics



Figure IV-4: Daily Traffic Volume Growth 2012-2040

Source: SBTAM

Future of the Subregion

2015





Source: SBTAM



Figure IV-6: PM Peak Period Forecast 2040 No Build Congestion

Source: SBTAM

#### V. **Transportation Investments**

Future investment strategies are anchored upon the commitments made to San Bernardino County voters with the reauthorization of Measure I. The near term investments are defined in the Ten-Year Delivery Plan while the Measure I Expenditure Plan provides a roadmap to investment for larger highway, arterial and transit projects over the life of Measure I. The Countywide Transportation Plan provides an additional level of detail to the Expenditure Plan, indicating projects that can be funded through the 2040 horizon year given current funding forecasts. However, funding commitments to specific projects are made by the SANBAG Board of Directors on a case-by-case basis as those individual projects are developed.

## **The Mobility Pyramid**

The transportation planning process is structured around the mobility pyramid (refer to Figure V-1) referenced as a foundation of the the RTP/SCS. SANBAG promotes an



Figure V-1: Mobility Pyramid

integrated approach to maximize the efficiency of the existing transportation system. It is a multi-modal approach involving the expansion of highway, arterial, transit and rail capacity and managing the system well, to provide a high degree of mobility for county residents, businesses, workers and visitors.

Following the mobility pyramid from bottom to top, SANBAG regularly monitors key facilities and systems, in partnership with Caltrans, local jurisdictions and transit agencies. This could involve identifying transportation bottlenecks, a need for transit service improvements, or geographic areas in need of further study and evaluation. Maintaining and preserving the existing infrastructure is



fundamental to good stewardship of the investments made in highway and transit system capacity. This is the responsibility of the highway/system owners, Caltrans for state highways, local jurisdictions for arterial streets, and transit agencies for their vehicles and rail lines. Although SANBAG is not currently an owner/operator, the agency provides substantial funding to operations and maintenance through Measure I, state and federal funding.

Although local jurisdictions retain land use authority, SANBAG coordinates with the jurisdictions and SCAG to encourage

V-1 Countywide Transportation Plan - FINAL

transit-supportive land use planning where possible. SCAG's growth visioning efforts have sought to integrate land use and transportation planning in response to the requirements of SB 375. Strategies have been developed to support SCS goals and objectives, such as promoting jobs/housing balance, implementing strategies to encourage walking, biking and transit use. SANBAG continues to support demand management through its vanpool and rideshare programs, maintenance of a traveler information system (IE511), development of a Non-Motorized Transportation Plan and continued study to extend the reach of transit service and make it more efficient. In addition, SANBAG has invested significantly in traffic signal synchronization in an effort to reduce arterial travel times and associated vehicle-generated air pollutants.

The final components included in the mobility pyramid include operational improvements and system completion and expansion. Over the past few decades, local jurisdictions, transit agencies, Caltrans and SANBAG have made great strides in expanding our transportation infrastructure and maximizing operational efficiencies. As intelligent transportation systems emerge to maximize efficient system operations, they will be evaluated and implemented where feasible. While progress has been made, more needs to be done to improve the transportation infrastructure for a growing population.

Based on the available funding identified in Section III, two scenarios have been identified for analysis in the CTP.

- Baseline Scenario Financially constrained scenario which could be funded assuming traditionally available revenue sources through the CTP horizon year of 2040.
- Aggressive Scenario All projects in the Baseline Scenario plus additional projects deemed necessary to support future transportation system demands. These assumptions are consistent with the SCAG RTP/SCS, which has been determined by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) to include "reasonably available funding sources" and is thus viewed to qualify as a financially constrained RTP/SCS.

It should be noted that the SANBAG definition of financial constraint in the CTP Baseline Scenario varies from the definition of financial constraint in the SCAG RTP/SCS. The Baseline Scenario is a more conservative view of the funding that may be available, which is important for SANBAG's own planning. The SCAG RTP/SCS includes "innovative funding sources" that are added to the traditionally available sources to fund the full RTP/SCS project list. Both are legitimate definitions of financial constraint, but the Baseline is more conservative than the Aggressive Scenario (i.e. the RTP/SCS scenario).

The Baseline Scenario includes all projects identified in the Measure I 2010-2040 Ten-Year Delivery Plan 2014 Update, plus projects that could be funded with estimates of traditionally available Measure I, DIF, State, and Federal funds after completion of the Delivery Plan. It should be noted that this estimate deals with total available funding and that there may be limitations on where much of the funding can be allocated and what projects might be eligible. The Aggressive Scenario completes certain projects beyond those in the Measure I Expenditure Plan and other projects in the various Measure I programs that cannot be funded with available revenue. For example, traditionally available revenues are not sufficient to build the entire list of Valley interchanges in the SANBAG Nexus Study. A phased approach is being examined to spread available funding across individual ramp improvements for a greater number of interchanges. The Aggressive Scenario includes the completion of the entire Valley Interchange Program.

Table V-1 presents the scenario summary including the types of projects assumed for each scenario and the funding sources for each scenario. Figure V-2 presents a visual representation of all projects included in the Aggressive Scenario.

|               | Table V-1: CTP Scenarios  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
|---------------|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|
|               | Projects  | Funding   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Racolina      | <ul> <li>10-Year Delivery Plan Plus Constrained Projects through<br/>2040:</li> <li>Freeway/Interchange Program (10-YDP Projects only)</li> <li>I-15 Express Lanes to US-395</li> <li>I-215 North HOV lane (SR-210 to I-15)</li> <li>Valley Interchange Phasing Program (constrained to<br/>revenue) or Priority 11-18 interchanges (note that<br/>priorities are being re-evaluated in 2015)</li> <li>Arterial Program (constrained to revenue)</li> <li>No additional grade separations</li> <li>Redlands Passenger Rail Project</li> <li>Gold Line to Montclair</li> <li>Metrolink double track (CP Lilac to CP Rancho)</li> <li>Metrolink expansion (50 daily trains)</li> <li>Active Transportation Projects supportable by grants and<br/>Transportation Development Act funds</li> <li>West Valley Connector Express Bus</li> <li>Foothill/5<sup>th</sup> Express Bus</li> </ul> | <ul> <li>Core Revenues, Financially Constrained<br/>Traditional sources:</li> <li>Measure I Forecast revenue in 10-YDP</li> <li>State revenues constrained to gas tax<br/>collections</li> <li>Federal revenues constrained to gas<br/>tax collections</li> <li>Tolls for express lane scenario</li> <li>Transit revenue adequate to cover<br/>current operations held at 3%</li> <li>Mitigation fees</li> </ul>  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CTP Scenarios | <ul> <li>Baseline Projects Plus the Following:</li> <li>Freeway Improvements <ul> <li>Full Buildout of I-215 from I-10 to SR-60 (including I-215/Washington-Mt Vernon interchange)</li> <li>I-215 mixed flow lane from SR-210 to I-15</li> <li>Completion of I-10 to Riverside Co. Line with HOV or Express Lanes</li> <li>SR-210 HOV lane from I-215 to I-10</li> <li>I-15 Express Lanes from US-395 to High Desert Corridor</li> <li>I-10/I-15 Express Lane Connectors</li> </ul> </li> </ul>   | <ul> <li>Match Funding to Infrastructure Need<br/>Potential options: <ul> <li>Tolls for express lane scenario</li> <li>Supplemental Measure I</li> </ul> </li> <li>State and Federal gas taxes indexed to be on par with current authorizations with inflation</li> <li>Regional/State/Federal VMT fee (or equivalent)</li> <li>Aggressive assumptions for State Bonds/Federal Stimulus</li> <li>Prop 1B-type infusion every 10 years</li> <li>Federal freight dollars</li> </ul> |  |  |  |  |  |

Table V-1. CTP Scenarios



#### Figure V-2: Aggressive Scenario Projects

# **Highway**

The Measure I Expenditure Plan (see <a href="http://www.sanbag.ca.gov/planning2/mi\_2010-2040/mi\_appendices.pdf">http://www.sanbag.ca.gov/planning2/mi\_2010-2040/mi\_appendices.pdf</a>) includes improvements for six San Bernardino Valley freeway corridors. Revenue for the San Bernardino Valley Freeway Program is projected to be adequate to implement all six projects except for the carpool lane connectors, under the Baseline Scenario. Projects that are not included in the Ten-Year Delivery Plan are not anticipated to be fundable with traditional revenue sources so there long-range projects have been included in the Aggressive Scenario. The following are the key freeway facility assumptions for the Baseline and Aggressive Scenarios:

**Baseline** 

- I-10 widening (Express Lanes from Los Angeles County Line to Ford Street in Ten-Year Delivery Plan)
- I-15 express lanes from Riverside County Line to US 395 (this is greater than the length of I-15 widening in the Expenditure Plan, which is the County line to I-215, widening to I-215 is already included in the Ten-Year Delivery Plan)
- I-215 widening from Riverside County Line to I-10 (completed)
- I-215 HOV lane from SR-210 to I-15

• SR-210 widening from Highland Avenue to I-10 (in Ten-Year Delivery Plan – widening from I-215 to Highland Avenue is not included in the Baseline Scenario)

#### Aggressive:

- Full buildout of I-215 from I-10 to SR-60 (including I-215/Washington-Mt. Vernon interchange)
- I-215 mixed flow land from SR-210 to I-15
- Completion of I-10 to Riverside County Line with HOV or Express Lanes
- SR-210 HOV lane from I-215 to I-10
- I-10/I-15 Express Lane connectors

# Transit



SANBAG has been a partner in the funding and operation of the

Metrolink commuter rail system since its inception in 1991. The San Bernardino line is the most heavily travelled line on the Metrolink system and operates 38 trains per day, including both inbound and outbound, from San Bernardino to Los Angeles. Metrolink will be operational to a new downtown transit center in San Bernardino by 2015. One double-track segment on the Metrolink San Bernardino Line is also feasible in the Baseline Scenario. Ontario has a Metrolink station on the Riverside line, but train frequencies are much lower than on the San Bernardino line, and the stations on that line are more isolated.

SANBAG also has a commitment of Measure I dollars in the Ten-Year Delivery Plan to the initiation of rail service to Redlands by 2020 and to SANBAG's portion of the extension of the Gold Line to Montclair, dependent upon the funding of the extension from Azusa in Los Angeles County. Further, 2% of Valley Measure I funds are devoted to Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) which rises to at least 5% in 2020. The E Street BRT line initiated revenue service in April 2014. Other potential BRT corridors have been identified for implementation, but further development of these corridors as full BRT operations has been put on hold due to capital and operating dollar limitations. However, the following are assumed for the Baseline and Aggressive Scenarios for the Valley (Refer to **Figure V-3** and **Figure V-4**):

#### **Baseline**

- West Valley Connector as express bus
- Foothill/5th Corridor as express bus
- Express bus-on-freeway routes in the I-10 corridor

#### Aggressive:

- West Valley Connector as full BRT
- Foothill/5th Corridor as full BRT
- Other corridors as express bus (refer to Figure V-3)

Expansion/adjustment of local transit service is assumed according to the Short Range Transit Plans of each transit agency in the Valley and Mountain/Desert. **Figure II-9** presented the existing bus transit network for San Bernardino County. **Figure II-15** presented the regional rail network, both existing and planned, including Metrolink and planned Redlands Rail in San Bernardino County.

The SCAG 2012-2035 RTP/SCS places substantial emphasis on existing and future transit corridors, and assumes that nodes of activity will develop, to varying degrees, at station areas. SANBAG, Metrolink and transit agencies need to coordinate the expansion and operation of the rail and bus network so that it is truly interconnected, coordinated and, to the extent possible, seamless.

In 2010 SANBAG developed a Long Range Transit Plan (LRTP) to address existing and future transit system needs. The LRTP provides a system of transit facilities and services that can increase transit's role in the future. Given the large and diverse nature of the county, the plan is split geographically into three areas: San Bernardino Valley; Victor Valley; and rural areas. This CTP reflects updates to transit planning by SANBAG and its partner agencies.

It is in the interest of both transit system efficiency and public benefit that land use around transit station areas be optimized in ways that take the most advantage of our investments in rail and bus transit. Generally, costs per passenger decrease and operational subsidies are reduced where activities around the transit station areas generate trips that can take advantage of the mobility the transit system provides. This implies that SANBAG actively collaborate with local jurisdictions on land use strategies that will mutually benefit both the transit systems and community development in station areas.







Figure V-4: Aggressive Scenario Transit Projects

SANBAG has already been actively planning with local jurisdictions in the Redlands Rail corridor, even though institution of service is several years away. Further, a land use and economic study of development at station areas on the San Bernardino Metrolink line was initiated in early 2014. Termed the "ARRIVE Corridor" (Advanced Regional Rail Integrated Vision - East), the study is bringing together local jurisdictions, urban planners, economic/real estate development professionals, transit agencies, and other stakeholders to define steps for successful TOD at stations along this corridor. The power of this strategy is that the San Bernardino Metrolink line is already an established, successful service. Enabling transit-supportive development to occur at stations along this line will increase the line's effectiveness, with little additional investment in actual operation. Although many barriers exist to substantial TOD development, the ARRIVE Corridor study is defining strategies to overcome those barriers. Considerations to promote TOD include changes to parking requirements, height limit restrictions, street design/layout, zoning restrictions and building codes.

SANBAG could be more involved in promoting development at transit station nodes through consideration of the following potential options, any of which would require SANBAG Board direction:

- Joint marketing initiative to attract potential TOD developers to the corridor
- Infrastructure funding initiatives to better position transit station areas to attract TOD

# Transportation Investments 2015



- Allowance for reduced development fees for qualifying developments in transit station areas
- Reduced local shares for projects that increase development capacity in transit station areas
- Prioritizing grant funding for transit, pedestrian, and bicycle improvements in transit station areas
- Funding contributions for shuttle services between Metrolink stations and major employers outside the normal walking envelope of the station.
- Partnerships with San Bernardino County employers to provide initial subsidies to employees who take Metrolink to work. Employee surveys may be appropriate to identify employers with the highest potential.
- Free or subsidized Omnitrans fares when transferring between Metrolink and Omnitrans
- Financing assistance for parking lot and garage projects that increase capacity and increase opportunities for TOD.

The Mountain/Desert transit agencies of San Bernardino County operate a combination of local fixed route and demand responsive services in circumstances tailored to their individual settings. The LRTP analyzed a continuation of the existing level of service throughout the life of the plan, and forecasts show sufficient funding over the life of the plan to support these services. However, as noted, the service expansions recommended in the LRTP Vision Alternative are not fully fundable, and as a result, the Baseline CTP Scenario does not include all LRTP recommendations.



V-8 Countywide Transportation Plan - FINAL

#### **CTP Baseline Scenario Performance**

**Table V-2** presents the performance statistics for San Bernardino County with implementation of the Baseline Scenario. The network improvements incorporated into the Baseline Scenario significantly improve operating characteristics. Vehicle hours travelled is reduced by over seven percent while delay is reduced by over 27 percent. Speeds on all facility types increase.

**Figure V-4** and **Figure V-5** present A.M. and P.M. peak period congestion, respectively, under 2040 Baseline Scenario conditions. As depicted in **Figure V-4** and **Figure V-5**, while growth strains the efficiency of many facilities throughout the county, highway and transit projects improve conditions significantly as compared to 2040 No Build conditions (refer to **Figure IV-5** and **Figure IV-6**). Specifically, arterial performance improves significantly with implementation of many local projects through the subarea Major Street and Major Local Highway programs.

The analysis of congestion levels highlights the need for further local and regional improvements to serve future transportation demands. While over \$8 billion dollars in State, Federal, Measure I and developer funds will be expended to implement the Baseline Scenario, additional funds are necessary to implement projects as evidenced by the forecast congestion in **Figure V-2** and **Figure V-4** on local and regional facilities throughout the county.

|                                 | Vehicle Miles | Vehicle Hours       | Vehicle Hours of | Average |  |  |  |  |
|---------------------------------|---------------|---------------------|------------------|---------|--|--|--|--|
| Facility Type                   | Traveled      | Traveled            | Delay            | Speed   |  |  |  |  |
| 2012                            |               |                     |                  |         |  |  |  |  |
| Freeways                        | 36,660,567    | 639,479             | 68,112           | 57.3    |  |  |  |  |
| Principal Arterial              | 7,888,090     | 221,647             | 41,084           | 35.6    |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Arterial                  | 8,108,461     | 226,534             | 23,336           | 35.8    |  |  |  |  |
| Collector                       | 3,805,711     | 115,763             | 8,450            | 32.9    |  |  |  |  |
| Total                           | 56,462,829    | 1,203,423           | 140,982          | 46.9    |  |  |  |  |
| 2040 No Build                   |               |                     |                  |         |  |  |  |  |
| Freeways                        | 50,402,741    | 1,043,912           | 260,584          | 48.3    |  |  |  |  |
| Principal Arterial              | 11,181,247    | 362,562             | 106,409          | 30.8    |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Arterial                  | 12,865,940    | 398,300             | 73,156           | 32.3    |  |  |  |  |
| Collector                       | 6,672,082     | 224,469             | 36,080           | 29.7    |  |  |  |  |
| Total                           | 81,122,010    | 2,029,243           | 476,229          | 40.0    |  |  |  |  |
|                                 | Differ        | ence from 2012      |                  |         |  |  |  |  |
| Freeways                        | 13,742,174    | 404,433             | 192,472          | -9.0    |  |  |  |  |
| Principal Arterial              | 3,293,157     | 140,915             | 65,325           | -4.7    |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Arterial                  | 4,757,479     | 171,766             | 49,820           | -3.5    |  |  |  |  |
| Collector                       | 2,866,371     | 108,706             | 27,630           | -3.2    |  |  |  |  |
| Total                           | 24,659,181    | 825,820             | 335,247          | -6.9    |  |  |  |  |
|                                 | % Diffe       | erence from 2012    |                  |         |  |  |  |  |
| Freeways                        | 37.5%         | 63.2%               | 282.6%           | -15.8%  |  |  |  |  |
| Principal Arterial              | 41.7%         | 63.6%               | 159.0%           | -13.3%  |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Arterial                  | 58.7%         | 75.8%               | 213.5%           | -9.8%   |  |  |  |  |
| Collector                       | 75.3%         | 93.9%               | 327.0%           | -9.6%   |  |  |  |  |
| Total                           | 43.7%         | 68.6%               | 237.8%           | -14.8%  |  |  |  |  |
|                                 | 20            | 040 Baseline        |                  |         |  |  |  |  |
| Freeways                        | 52,202,977    | 1,022,315           | 209,168          | 51.1    |  |  |  |  |
| Principal Arterial              | 11,449,828    | 322,405             | 67,851           | 35.5    |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Arterial                  | 13,478,079    | 392,852             | 56,091           | 34.3    |  |  |  |  |
| Collector                       | 5,531,693     | 169,658             | 16,785           | 32.6    |  |  |  |  |
| Total                           | 82,662,578    | 1,907,230           | 349,896          | 43.3    |  |  |  |  |
|                                 | Difference    | e from 2040 No Buil | ld               |         |  |  |  |  |
| Freeways                        | 1,800,236     | -21,597             | -51,416          | 2.8     |  |  |  |  |
| Principal Arterial              | 268,581       | -40,157             | -38,558          | 4.7     |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Arterial                  | 612,139       | -5,448              | -17,065          | 2.0     |  |  |  |  |
| Collector                       | -1,140,389    | -54,811             | -19,295          | 2.9     |  |  |  |  |
| Total                           | 1,540,568     | -122,013            | -126,333         | 3.3     |  |  |  |  |
| % Difference from 2040 No Build |               |                     |                  |         |  |  |  |  |
| Freeways                        | 3.6%          | -2.1%               | -19.7%           | 5.7%    |  |  |  |  |
| Principal Arterial              | 2.4%          | -11.1%              | -36.2%           | 15.3%   |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Arterial                  | 4.8%          | -1.4%               | -23.3%           | 6.2%    |  |  |  |  |
| Collector                       | -17.1%        | -24.4%              | -53.5%           | 9.8%    |  |  |  |  |
| Total                           | 1.9%          | -6.0%               | -26.5%           | 8.4%    |  |  |  |  |

#### Table V-2: Forecast 2040 San Bernardino County Baseline Scenario Performance Statistics

Source: SBTAM



Figure V-5: AM Peak Period Forecast 2040 Baseline Scenario Congestion



#### Figure V-6: PM Peak Period Forecast 2040 Baseline Scenario Congestion

#### **CTP Aggressive Scenario Performance**

**Table V-3** presents the performance statistics for San Bernardino County with implementation of the Baseline Scenario. The network improvements incorporated into the Baseline Scenario significantly improve operating characteristics. Vehicle hours travelled is reduced by over six percent while delay is reduced by over 25 percent. Speeds on all facility types increase.

**Figure V-6** and **Figure V-7** present A.M. and P.M. peak period congestion, respectively, under 2040 Aggressive Scenario conditions. As depicted in **Figure V-6** and **Figure V-7**, while growth strains the efficiency of many facilities throughout the county, highway and transit projects improve conditions significantly as compared to 2040 No Build conditions (refer to **Figure IV-5** and **Figure IV-6**). Specifically, arterial performance improves significantly with implementation of many local projects through the subarea Major Street and Major Local Highway programs. In addition, conditions are improved from 2040 Baseline conditions. Even with all of the improvements from the Baseline and Aggressive scenarios, further improvements are warranted based on the forecast congestion.

|                                 | Vehicle Miles | Vehicle Hours       | Vehicle Hours of | Average |  |  |  |  |
|---------------------------------|---------------|---------------------|------------------|---------|--|--|--|--|
| Facility Type                   | Traveled      | Traveled            | Delay            | Speed   |  |  |  |  |
|                                 |               | 040 No Build        |                  |         |  |  |  |  |
| Freeways                        | 50,402,741    | 1,043,912           | 260,584          | 48.3    |  |  |  |  |
| Principal Arterial              | 11,181,247    | 362,562             | 106,409          | 30.8    |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Arterial                  | 12,865,940    | 398,300             | 73,156           | 32.3    |  |  |  |  |
| Collector                       | 6,672,082     | 224,469             | 36,080           | 29.7    |  |  |  |  |
| Total                           | 81,122,010    | 2,029,243           | 476,229          | 40.0    |  |  |  |  |
| 2040 Baseline                   |               |                     |                  |         |  |  |  |  |
| Freeways                        | 52,202,977    | 1,022,315           | 209,168          | 51.1    |  |  |  |  |
| Principal Arterial              | 11,449,828    | 322,405             | 67,851           | 35.5    |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Arterial                  | 13,478,079    | 392,852             | 56,091           | 34.3    |  |  |  |  |
| Collector                       | 5,531,693     | 169,658             | 16,785           | 32.6    |  |  |  |  |
| Total                           | 82,662,578    | 1,907,230           | 349,896          | 43.3    |  |  |  |  |
|                                 | Difference    | e from 2040 No Buil | d                |         |  |  |  |  |
| Freeways                        | 1,800,236     | -21,597             | -51,416          | 2.8     |  |  |  |  |
| Principal Arterial              | 268,581       | -40,157             | -38,558          | 4.7     |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Arterial                  | 612,139       | -5,448              | -17,065          | 2.0     |  |  |  |  |
| Collector                       | -1,140,389    | -54,811             | -19,295          | 2.9     |  |  |  |  |
| Total                           | 1,540,568     | -122,013            | -126,333         | 3.3     |  |  |  |  |
|                                 | % Differen    | ce from 2040 No Bu  | ild              |         |  |  |  |  |
| Freeways                        | 3.6%          | -2.1%               | -19.7%           | 5.7%    |  |  |  |  |
| Principal Arterial              | 2.4%          | -11.1%              | -36.2%           | 15.3%   |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Arterial                  | 4.8%          | -1.4%               | -23.3%           | 6.2%    |  |  |  |  |
| Collector                       | -17.1%        | -24.4%              | -53.5%           | 9.8%    |  |  |  |  |
| Total                           | 1.9%          | -6.0%               | -26.5%           | 8.4%    |  |  |  |  |
|                                 | 20            | 40 Aggressive       |                  |         |  |  |  |  |
| Freeways                        | 52,767,575    | 1,031,886           | 210,773          | 51.1    |  |  |  |  |
| Principal Arterial              | 11,520,670    | 312,068             | 30,991           | 36.9    |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Arterial                  | 13,185,233    | 377,662             | 25,502           | 34.9    |  |  |  |  |
| Collector                       | 5,471,648     | 165,287             | 7,171            | 33.1    |  |  |  |  |
| Total                           | 82,945,126    | 1,886,904           | 274,436          | 44.0    |  |  |  |  |
|                                 |               | e from 2040 No Buil |                  |         |  |  |  |  |
| Freeways                        | 2,364,834     | -12,026             | -49,811          | 2.8     |  |  |  |  |
| Principal Arterial              | 339,423       | -50,494             | -75,418          | 6.1     |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Arterial                  | 319,293       | -20,638             | -47,654          | 2.6     |  |  |  |  |
| Collector                       | -1,200,434    | -59,182             | -28,909          | 3.4     |  |  |  |  |
| Total                           | 1,823,116     | -142,339            | -201,793         | 4.0     |  |  |  |  |
| % Difference from 2040 No Build |               |                     |                  |         |  |  |  |  |
| Freeways                        | 4.7%          | -1.2%               | -19.1%           | 5.9%    |  |  |  |  |
| Principal Arterial              | 3.0%          | -13.9%              | -70.9%           | 19.9%   |  |  |  |  |
| Minor Arterial                  | 2.5%          | -5.2%               | -65.1%           | 8.1%    |  |  |  |  |
| Collector                       | -18.0%        | -26.4%              | -80.1%           | 11.5%   |  |  |  |  |
| Total                           | 2.2%          | -7.0%               | -42.4%           | 9.9%    |  |  |  |  |

#### Table V-3: Forecast 2040 San Bernardino County Aggressive Scenario Performance Statistics

Source: SBTAM





Source: SBTAM





Source: SBTAM

# Airports

While regional air passenger travel declined during the recession, growth is picking up as the economy improves. Ontario International Airport (ONT) has experienced a decline in air travel for a variety of reasons. Some of the local air service has shifted to Los Angeles International Airport. The City of Ontario is continuing its quest to regain local control of ONT from the Los Angeles World Airports (LAWA). Benefits to local control include increased options for air service, greater convenience for local residents and economic benefits for businesses and local governments in San Bernardino County. Forecast 2035 airport demand for ONT ranges from 19.2 to 31.6 million annual air



passengers per the 2012 RTP/SCS. The Southern California Logistics Airport (SCLA) 2035 forecast ranges from 0.4 to 1.6 million annual air passengers, and the forecast for San Bernardino International Airport (SBIA) ranges from 1.8 to 6.7 million annual air passengers. Cargo service at these three airports is expected to be over 1.3 million annual tons at ONT, approximately 68,000 tons at SCLA and 146,000 tons at SBIA. The forecasts will be updated to 2040 as part of the 2016 RTP/SCS and initial indications are that the forecasts will be lower.

Future airport investment strategies will be greatly enhanced by local control of ONT and expansion of highway and transit connectivity to ONT. In addition, initiatives should be taken to grow passenger and cargo activity at SCLA and SBIA as those opportunities are presented.

# **Goods Movement/Freight**

SANBAG developed and adopted a Goods Movement/Freight Strategy in 2014. The following were recommended as priorities or initiatives that SANBAG could pursue in the context of the agency's role as transportation authority, county transportation commission, and council of governments with respect to goods movement/freight.

- Infrastructure Continue to build the highway infrastructure needed to support efficient freight movement. An effective supply chain consists of many parts, one of which involves building and maintaining the infrastructure. Cost-effective transportation system upgrades improve productivity and competitiveness. Continued expansion is needed for freeway mainlines, freight-serving freeway interchanges, and rail/highway grade separations.
- Land Use Planning Encourage proper planning by local jurisdictions at the interfaces of residential areas with warehouse/distribution areas through wise land use decisions, buffering, and effective truck routing. Improper planning leads to later problems for all concerned. Buffers must also be considered for residential uses that are near sensitive air-



quality receptors such as freeways or rail lines even within transit oriented developments. The logistics sector needs to grow to keep up with demand, but it can still be a good neighbor as it



grows.

• Promotion - Promote the merits of San Bernardino County's world-class transportation system by providing information to economic development departments regarding SANBAG, Caltrans, and local jurisdiction investments in infrastructure.

• Economic Development and Air Quality - Work with other regional agencies to structure economic development and air quality initiatives as a "win-win." Advances in air quality are important specifically for public health purposes, but they can

only be afforded when the economy is also strong. The region must be careful not to undermine the economic means to solve the air quality problem by trying to impose upon industry requirements they cannot afford. SANBAG should participate in regional conversations on how to strike a balance between maintaining jobs and cleaning the air. The air quality successes of the last several decades have taught us that air quality goals are best achieved through incentivizing adoption of advances in clean vehicles and fuels, not by limiting growth. The great strides in air quality improvement over the last several decades have been made at the same time that regional vehicle miles of travel (VMT) have more than doubled. So too, the logistics sector can still expand to meet the growing needs of commerce while at the same time making substantial progress on the air quality front, by focusing on vehicle and fuels technology.

- Incentives/Grants for Air Quality Improvement Seek grants and provide information on opportunities for financial assistance to San Bernardino County trucking companies and truck owner/operators in maintaining compliance with air quality requirements.
- Anticipate Future Trends Technology is changing rapidly, and the ability to adapt to those changes will keep San Bernardino County competitive. For example, trends in automation of warehousing should be monitored to assess their impact on the economic value and local costs of permitted warehouse development. Partnerships with the private sector will become ever more important as the region seeks to keep pace with competition in the global economy.
- Education and Employment Through the Countywide Vision, improve employment pathways to the logistics industry. This will take guidance from the industries and the primary/secondary educational systems upon which they depend for their labor pool. There are a number of reasons why poverty rates have increased in San Bernardino County, but the logistics industry can be part of the solution as a relatively stable and growing source of jobs with pathways to the middle class.
- Truck Routes Work with State and local partners to provide greater clarity and local education regarding Surface Transportation Assistance Act (STAA) truck routes and clear national, regional and local truck route maps.
- Funding With regional, state, and federal partners, seek equitable ways to continue to fund freight-related infrastructure and its maintenance. The



logistics industry has generally indicated that it is willing to pay for cost-effective infrastructure improvements that directly benefit their business.

- Airports Work with local jurisdiction partners to define policies that will lead to greater use of the three airports in San Bernardino County by freight-related businesses. Continue to support local control of Ontario International Airport.
- Project Readiness Position SANBAG for state and federal funding opportunities by developing as many freight-related projects as possible through the Project Approval and Environmental Documentation (PA&ED) stage. Include clearance under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) where there are opportunities for substantial federal funds.
- Awareness Create and maintain greater awareness about goods movement issues affecting San Bernardino County among the SANBAG Board of Directors, state and federal elected and appointed officials, local agency technical staff, and the public.

San Bernardino County has benefitted from its location advantages and world-class transportation system as the logistics sector has grown. Although many opportunities remain, future success is not assured. The Great Recession demonstrated how fragile the Inland Empire economy can be, as San Bernardino County still lags behind the pace of recovery of coastal counties. A critical review of San Bernardino County's freight system was conducted as part of the development of a SANBAG freight strategy in 2014. The review was conducted as a "SWOT analysis" with respect to freight – What Strengths does the County have, what are its Weaknesses, what Opportunities are likely to be available in the future, and what are the Threats to future success? The results are summarized below.

#### Strengths

- Location advantages as an international gateway
- A world-class highway network and rail for freight mobility
- Presence of logistics and distribution facilities operated by some of the largest corporations in the U.S.
- Proactive local economic development agencies
- A substantial labor force
- Excellent regional partners
- Substantial funding for infrastructure
- A substantial supply of developable land

#### Weaknesses

- The K-12 educational system is not yet adequately equipping students for some of the jobs the County is capable of attracting.
- Impacts of the logistics sector have not always been managed well - lack of foresight in planning has resulted in trucks passing by or through neighborhoods, with spillover noise, pollution, and impacts on residential communities at the edges of warehousing districts.





- Difficulty competing with coastal communities for the more attractive jobs.
- Land for logistics facility development, though still available, is becoming more scarce.
- The extent of industrial/warehouse/logistics development and the associated trucks, trains, and air quality problems sometimes casts a negative image of San Bernardino County in general.

#### **Opportunities**

- International trade is poised to expand further Despite the Panama Canal expansion and increased competition from other North American ports, forecasts show a near tripling of container volume through the ports in the next 25 years.
- The Inland transportation network is, so far, keeping pace with expansion of the logistics sector.
- Southern California is a stable and growing market for products and services that county businesses can provide.
- If local control of Ontario International Airport is obtained, this area can become an even greater economic engine.
- Over time, it can be expected that the cost advantages of production in eastern Asia will lessen, creating more opportunities for production and manufacturing in North America, including Southern California.

#### Threats

- State and regional regulation California is near the bottom of the national list of states in terms of friendliness for business.
- Other states are eager to capture Southern California's logistics jobs.
- Although the region, including the logistics sector, has made enormous strides in cleaning up the

air, achievement of National Ambient Air Quality Standards remains a daunting and expensive challenge. Overly aggressive regulatory timelines, though wellintentioned, could undermine the very economy that would enable the necessary air guality investments to occur.

- The supply of affordable land is not inexhaustible.
- Trucks are hard on roadway infrastructure, and with declining revenue streams, funding is projected to fall far short of maintenance needs in the future.
- Automation could lessen the job-creation benefits of portions of the logistics sector.



• Attaining the federal ozone standards is likely to require a complete transformation of our transportation and energy sectors. Based on a joint visioning exercise by ARB, SCAQMD, and San Joaquin Valley Unified APCD, one path to attainment requires a nearly complete transformation of passenger vehicles to zero-emission technologies, approximately 80 percent of the truck fleet



to zero-or near-zero technology, and nearly all locomotives operating in the South Coast Air Basin to be using some form of zero-emission technology. Such dramatic changes will inevitably require huge investment in and fundamental change to the regional transportation and energy infrastructure. It is questionable whether these transformational changes are physically and economically feasible within the timeframes defined by the federal government.

• San Bernardino County welcomes the improvements in air quality that would result from these investments, but is highly concerned that this will undermine the economic growth associated with the logistics industry, which the County desperately needs.

In summary, San Bernardino County and its logistics-driven economy exist in a highly competitive environment. We live within a dynamic world economy with intense competition for the jobs and revenue that are derived from the flow of goods. All the environmental advances we seek cannot be achieved without a strong economy to finance them. SANBAG and its regional agency partners must pursue environmental objectives in ways that do not undermine the economic means to achieve them. At the same time, we must thoughtfully plan for continued expansion of logistics capacity in ways that insulate communities from their impacts. This will require collaboration across multiple disciplines and more comprehensive approaches than in the past.

# **Active Transportation**

Adoption of the 2012-2035 RTP/SCS resulted in a heightened awareness of active transportation. Active transportation includes non-motorized travel and is a key component of the overall strategy to satisfy state mandated GHG reduction targets defined in AB 32 and SB 375. The 2012-2035 RTP/SCS allocated \$6.7 billion for active transportation projects throughout the SCAG region. These projects will increase bikeway miles, bring sidewalks into compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), improve first-mile and last-mile connections to transit, improve safety, etc.

SANBAG will continue to incorporate strategies identified in the NMTP to enhance active transportation mobility. Continued support will be provided for the planning and implementation of Safe Routes to School as well as the implementation of complete streets. A coordinated effort is underway to evaluate all modes of travel and integrate active transportation components where appropriate. Specific SANBAG active transportation initiatives include the following:

- Development and Implementation of a Countywide Complete Streets Strategy
- Development of a Countywide Safe Routes to School Strategic Plan



- Monitoring State and Federal funding tools to ensure local jurisdictions have adequate funding to implement active transportation infrastructure
- Collaboration to support SCAG's regional efforts in developing performance measures and monitoring tools for active transportation and public health
- Support public health efforts to reduce asthma incidence, obesity and heart diseases through promotion of active transportation policies and infrastructure

The NMTP continues to be the living document that strategically guides the development and implementation of active transportation infrastructure. The plan includes active transportation projects for each jurisdiction. As many of the funding opportunities for active transportation are grant programs, inclusion of projects into the countywide NMTP is often required for grant funding consideration. In order to keep pace with the development of bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure projects and leverage as much funding for these facilities as possible, the NMTP is and will be amended regularly to ensure it is current with amendment adopted by the SANBAG Board of Directors. A map of existing and future bicycle facilities was previously provided in **Figure II-24**.

The focus now is obtaining funding, including grant funding, to construct improvements identified in the NMTP. SANBAG, in partnership with local jurisdictions and transit agencies, is pursuing all available grant funding, including the new State/Regional Active Transportation Program (ATP), Local Transportation Fund (LTF) Article 3 funds, and potential local use of Measure I funds. SANBAG and the jurisdictions are committed to identifying grant opportunities for bicycle and pedestrian projects wherever they may exist. Pursuit of these grants, in conjunction with local jurisdictions, is a primary strategy for implementing the NMTP.

The San Bernardino County Active Transportation Network (SBCATN), an informal collaboration of public agencies and advocacy groups with an interest in active transportation, has been established to help coordinate and collaborate on bicycle and pedestrian facility planning and implementation. The Network has served as an excellent forum for communication on active transportation and health-related issues related to the built environment. SANBAG will continue to be involved with the activities of this group.

# VI. Transportation Strategy

The focus of SANBAG's strategy is the development and maintenance of a sustainable transportation system. The needs of all users and transportation modes must be considered to ensure a balanced system. It is incumbent upon SANBAG to plan, implement and maintain a transportation system that fosters regional and national economic competitiveness and provides for efficient movements of people and goods within, through and to San Bernardino County.

As noted previously, the Measure I 2010-2040 Strategic Plan identified implementation strategies for each individual Measure I program with some elements of the strategies applicable to all Measure I programs throughout the county. The countywide implementation strategies are designed to effectively deliver the transportation projects for which Measure I was approved by the voters. Implementation strategies common to all Measure I programs include:

- Strategy 1: Maximize revenue
- Strategy 2: Control project and program cost
- Strategy 3: Accelerate project delivery through borrowing, where appropriate
- Strategy 4: Remove obstacles to timely project development

There are two parts to SANBAG's transportation strategy: a set of overarching principles, coupled with individual strategies by geographic area, mode, and function. The overarching principles and strategies identified in the CTP build off of the implementation strategies identified in the Strategic Plan (refer to Page III-1 of the Strategic Plan for the implementation strategy discussion).

# **Overarching Principles**

- 1. **Customer focus** SANBAG and other public agencies exist to serve their traveling "customers." Customers extend across all auto, transit, truck, and non-motorized modes.
- 2. **Partnership-building** SANBAG is part of a multi-agency team to deliver mobility and safety improvements to our customers. Other important parts of the team include Caltrans, transit agencies, local jurisdictions, SCAG, and air quality management districts. Good communication and collaboration is essential for each agency to accomplish its part of the overall mission.
- 3. **Stewardship** The public has entrusted resources to SANBAG and other transportation-related agencies. We must be good stewards of both the limited financial resources available and the environmental resources we need to preserve as the system is built.
- 4. **Cost-effectiveness** Investments should be made in a way that maximizes the benefits derived from the available resources, with due attention given to geographic equity.
- 5. **Economic competitiveness** The transportation system exists to enable the businesses and residents of San Bernardino County to thrive. Our continued investment in transportation efficiency will enhance San Bernardino County as a business location.
- 6. Delivering on commitments Commitments are made at multiple levels, but major ones include: delivering the range of projects reflected in the Measure I Expenditure Plan; equitably distributing State, federal, and Measure I funding to the county's transit agencies and local jurisdictions; supporting implementation of the San Bernardino Countywide Vision; fulfilling commitments in the Sustainability MOU with SCAG; and supporting other statewide sustainability goals while fostering economic growth.

 System preservation – SANBAG and its agency partners need to work together to estimate maintenance needs and seek the funding needed to preserve/operate capital investment in highways and transit systems.

# **CTP Key Strategic Issues**

The previous sections have highlighted a number of issues and concerns about transportation and sustainability in San Bernardino County. Summarized below are several of the key strategic issues that will need to be addressed going forward. There are many other issues as well, but these

#### **CTP Key Issues**

- Transportation funding
- Congestion relief and economic competitiveness
- System preservation and operations
- Land use
- Transit system interconnectivity
- Attainment of air quality standards
- Sustainability and GHG reduction

represent key areas where SANBAG should consider taking action or advocating positions. These are followed by a discussion of individual strategies categorized by geography, mode, and functional area.

- Transportation funding It is well known that State and federal funding levels are not keeping up with operations and maintenance needs and requirements for new or expanded infrastructure. Figure III-3 presented the decline in purchasing power of the state gas tax in cents per gallon. In the meantime, the population of the Inland Empire increased 63% in the 20 years from 1990 to 2010, a growth rate of 2.5% per year. Local funds now represent over 50% of transportation infrastructure revenue in San Bernardino County.
- Congestion relief and economic competitiveness Although the statewide emphasis has shifted to sustainability, the need for congestion relief cannot be ignored. We live in a globally

competitive environment, in which the speed and cost of doing business still matters a great deal. It is essential that San Bernardino County maintain the transportation advantages that we currently enjoy with our robust freeway and interchange network to support the logistics industry. Some 20% of our jobs are now related to logistics, and logistics hubs will continue to play a major role in bringing business and employment to our area.

 System preservation and operations – The tens of billions of dollars in street and highway infrastructure investment must be preserved. Although Caltrans and local jurisdictions are the owners and operators of our freeways and arterial streets, SANBAG can be a partner with them to



ensure that these roadways and structures are maintained and that the operations are optimized. Routine maintenance can avoid the much larger expenditures that will be incurred from neglect. Likewise, the need for operating funds for transit is a major emerging issue and will limit transit network expansion if it is not addressed. Real-time information and technology both play a key role in maximizing system operations and efficiency.

4. Land use – SANBAG and local jurisdictions are aggressively promoting transit oriented development (TOD) as part of a strategy for economic growth and for achieving the regional SB 375 targets. An example is the study for the ARRIVE Corridor along the San Bernardino Metrolink line, which is exploring achievable strategies for TOD for each of the six stations along this line in San Bernardino County. The challenge with TOD in San Bernardino County has to do with market readiness. Jurisdictions cannot impose development types and densities that the
market cannot yet afford. The strategy must be one of preparing for TOD, while also being patient and demonstrating commitment to rail/transit infrastructure that will attract TOD developers. Most jurisdictions with rail station assets are ready to support TOD, and some have had recent success, but they may need assistance with infrastructure investment, which was

dealt a serious blow with the State's dissolution of redevelopment agencies.

5. Transit system interconnectivity – The transit network is growing, both regionally and in the Inland Empire and in terms of both rail and bus. Improved coordination is needed across transit (rail, fixed route bus, and demand responsive) and ridesharing modes (carpool and vanpool) to provide a high level of customer service at an affordable cost. The telecommunications industry reminds us that successful communications is all about the network. The same is true in building the transit and



ridesharing system, and we need to think in terms of interconnectivity, not independent systems.

- 6. Attainment of air quality standards Ozone attainment in the South Coast Air Basin is at a critical juncture. As the Basin gets closer to background ozone concentrations (estimated by SCAQMD at 48 ppb), the path to attainment will require adoption of technologies and fleet turnover rates that are acknowledged by many as not feasible within the timelines prescribed by EPA. We need to push forward on air quality improvements and realize the associated public health benefits, but at a rate that our local economy and industry can absorb, based on technologies that can be cost-effectively incorporated into the marketplace. A balanced approach is needed.
- 7. Sustainability and GHG reduction SANBAG and our local agency partners have been leaders in regional planning for GHG reduction. The lofty goals of AB 32 and GHG-related Executive Orders now need to be translated into an approach that can achieve those goals without damaging the economy or our region's competitiveness. Recent analysis in the California Transportation Plan has indicated that land use change and expansion of transit services will produce a relatively small portion of the GHG reductions needed. The analysis indicated that radical transformation in vehicle and fuels technology will need to be the primary mechanism to produce the 80% reduction in GHGs from the transportation fleet targeted for 2050 and 40% by 2030. As with attainment for criteria pollutants, GHG reductions need to be approached in a balanced way.

# **Individual Strategies**

Individual strategies can be grouped into three primary categories:

- Geographic
- Modal
- Functional

**Table VI-1** offers strategies that address specific challenges associated with each of the categories listed above. Modal categories have been nested into the primary geographic subareas of the Measure I Strategic Plan. The primary challenge or challenges associated with each component are identified, along with corresponding strategies that address the challenges.

| Category                             | Challenge   | Strategy  |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|
| Valley Categories b                  | -   |   |
| Freeway system                       | Forecasts show that the system will be<br>highly congested by 2040. Funding for<br>capacity and operational<br>enhancements to the system is<br>expected to be constrained.   | Position the freeway system to adapt to future<br>demands by using a managed lane approach and<br>improved traffic management and information<br>systems across all freeways.   |
| Freeway<br>interchanges              | Projected Measure I, state, and federal<br>funds will be insufficient to meet all<br>the interchange improvement needs.   | Spread Measure I funds across interchange hot-<br>spots using both a phased approach and right-sizing<br>of full interchange improvements. Look to a future<br>Measure I, state, and federal funds to complete the<br>freeway interchange program.  |
| Rail/highway<br>grade<br>separations | Projected Measure I, state, and federal<br>funds will be insufficient to build all<br>the grade separations identified.   | Prioritize additional grade separations and proceed<br>with project development on at least two projects,<br>to take advantage of potential future freight funding<br>opportunities.  |
| Arterials                            | Arterial project construction has lagged original expectations.   | Encourage jurisdictions to accelerate arterial<br>improvement projects and continue policy flexibility<br>for funding development shares. SANBAG will<br>identify arterial improvements that are particularly<br>important to route continuity.   |
| Passenger Rail                       | Stations along the Metrolink San<br>Bernardino Line and the Redlands Rail<br>corridor are our most significant<br>opportunities for transit oriented<br>development and transit-related<br>economic growth. Funds for rail<br>services are limited, and Metrolink<br>costs are increasing faster than<br>available funding. | To encourage investment, jurisdictions along these<br>corridors need assurances from SANBAG/Metrolink<br>that service can be maintained and, ideally,<br>expanded. Develop a sustainable funding plan, and<br>integrate operations for these corridors wherever<br>possible. Position Metrolink capacity-enhancement<br>projects for future implementation funding. |
| Gold Line                            | Timing of extension of Gold Line to<br>Montclair and beyond is uncertain, and<br>issue of overlapping Metrolink/Gold<br>Line/ONT corridors needs to be<br>resolved.   | Develop an integrated operational/funding solution<br>for Gold Line and Metrolink in coordination with LA<br>Metro, Metrolink, and local jurisdictions.   |
| Transit<br>Connection to<br>ONT      | The City of Ontario is negotiating for<br>the transfer of control of Ontario<br>International Airport to the City. The<br>region would benefit from improved<br>transit access for passengers and<br>employees.   | Take a phased approach to transit access to ONT,<br>beginning with shuttle service from the Metrolink<br>Rancho Cucamonga station, with a possible longer<br>term solution emerging from corridor-level analysis.   |
| Bus Rapid Transit<br>(BRT)           | The cost of building all the BRT<br>corridors in the Long Range Transit<br>Plan far exceeds available funding. The<br>proper technology solution to carry<br>across future express bus/BRT<br>corridors also needs to be resolved.  | Reevaluate the Express Bus/BRT strategic plan to<br>determine how premium transit should be staged<br>and funded across the Valley. The plan should<br>address corridor priorities, phasing, technology, and<br>funding options, providing information for the<br>Board to decide on the appropriate BRT/Arterial<br>funding split by 2020.                         |

## Table VI-1: Summary of Long-Term Transportation and Sustainability Strategies

| Category  | Category Challenge Strategy   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|   | Valley Categories by Mode, Continued  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fixed-route bus<br>service                              | Sustainable funding for operations is the biggest challenge.  | Study the challenges of the trajectory of transit operations funding, and jointly develop solutions between SANBAG and Omnitrans.  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Airports  | Passenger service has declined<br>significantly at ONT over the past<br>decade, attributed in part to current<br>management policies.   | Support Ontario and the region in the effort to regain local control of ONT, and make ONT, SBIA, and SCLA more competitive as destinations for passengers and freight.   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Active<br>Transportation                                | Large funding needs for building out the cycling/walking network  | <ul> <li>Continue to submit competitive grant applications<br/>to support implementation of the Non-motorized<br/>Transportation Plan (NMTP).</li> <li>Maintain and update the NMTP</li> <li>Identify and pursue grant funding opportunities<br/>to expand cycling and walking infrastructure</li> </ul> |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Demand-<br>responsive bus<br>service                    | Demand-responsive service is the<br>highest cost form of transit, but<br>important in serving certain senior and<br>disabled transit riders. Under the<br>Americans with Disabilities Act, transit<br>operators are required to provide<br>paratransit service within ¾-mile of<br>fixed routes for passengers with<br>disabilities who cannot ride fixed-route<br>service. | Continue assistance programs, such as helping<br>demand-responsive riders use fixed-route systems<br>and coordination with non-profit entities while also<br>maintaining demand-responsive service.  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Transit<br>integration and<br>inter-connectivity        | Transit services could be better<br>coordinated across systems in terms of<br>ease of transfers, fare media, and<br>first/last mile connections. This will be<br>even more important as the system<br>grows.  | Take a more integrated, customer-focused<br>approach to the provision of transit services.<br>Facilitate seamless ticketing and better connection<br>at existing transit centers and connection points.  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mountain/Desert S                                       |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Victor Valley<br>highway projects                       | Growth forecasts show a near doubling in traffic volume by 2040.  | Prioritize projects that will provide the most cost-<br>effective congestion reduction benefit, designating<br>projects for Major Local Highway funding through<br>the subarea process. Continue to advocate the High<br>Desert Corridor as a P3 project.  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mountain/Desert<br>fixed route transit                  | Funds are limited for route expansion<br>and adjustment as the Victor Valley<br>grows.  | Study the challenges of the trajectory of transit<br>operations funding, and jointly develop solutions<br>between SANBAG and the Mountain/Desert transit<br>agencies.  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mountain/Desert<br>demand-<br>responsive bus<br>service | Demand-responsive service is the<br>highest cost form of transit, but<br>important in serving certain senior and<br>disabled transit riders.  | Continue assistance programs, such as helping<br>demand-responsive riders use fixed-route systems<br>and coordination with non-profit entities while also<br>maintaining demand-responsive service.  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mountain<br>Subarea                                     | Though baseline population is small,<br>major congestion occurs on weekends,<br>particularly winter weekends, limiting<br>economic growth.  | Conduct a study of bottleneck locations and lower-<br>cost improvements that could reduce weekend<br>congestion levels and prioritize funding for those<br>projects.   |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Table VI-1: Summary of Long-Term Transportation and Sustainability Strategies, Continued



| Category  | Category Challenge Strategy   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|   | Strategies, Continued   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Morongo Basin                                   | The Basin is steadily growing, and SR-<br>62 is the only viable transportation<br>route through Yucca Valley and<br>Twentynine Palms.   | Implement improvement projects identified through the Morongo Basin Area Transportation Study (MBATS).   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| North Desert                                    | The North Desert has major highway needs, but limited funding.  | Evaluate long-term priorities for project investments in the subarea.  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Colorado River                                  | Funds are extremely limited for<br>improvements in this subarea.  | Smaller-scale, affordable improvements should be investigated and prioritized by the subarea.  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Functional Categor                              | ies   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Highway<br>Maintenance and<br>Operations        | Highways are facing serious future<br>maintenance funding shortfalls. Local<br>jurisdictions are responsible for<br>arterial maintenance while Caltrans is<br>responsible for freeway and state<br>highway maintenance.                                   | Conduct a strategic planning study with Caltrans and regional agencies to assess maintenance/operations funding needs and approaches to managing costs.  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rural Highway<br>Needs                          | Rural areas require unique<br>maintenance/safety/funding<br>consideration.  | Focus on cost effective maintenance and support for<br>funding streams that the County and Caltrans can<br>utilize to maintain these rural highways.   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Transit System<br>Maintenance and<br>Operations | Existing transit systems are facing<br>potentially serious future operations<br>funding shortfalls.   | Optimize transit operations and identify mechanisms to fund future system operations and expansion.  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Air Quality                                     | Although air quality has dramatically<br>improved over the last several<br>decades, attainment of the next set of<br>ozone standards will be extraordinarily<br>challenging and costly.   | Work with regional and state agencies and the<br>private sector to meet attainment standards on an<br>achievable timeline that does not adversely impact<br>the economy. Advocate for state/federal investment<br>that facilitates this progress. Focus on market-based<br>mobile source technology improvements and fleet<br>turnover as a win-win approach.                      |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sustainable<br>Growth                           | The state's GHG reduction goal of 80%<br>by 2050 is an enormous challenge. If<br>not done carefully, it may undermine<br>the economy to the point where it will<br>be impossible to afford the technology<br>improvements needed to achieve this<br>goal. | Assist state/regional agencies and the private sector<br>in technology research and implementation<br>strategies that are technologically feasible and cost-<br>effective (per AB 32) for San Bernardino County.<br>Implementation should follow the natural course of<br>vehicle life cycles and fleet turnover, to the extent<br>possible.                                       |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Habitat<br>Conservation                         | Habitat conservation currently occurs<br>on a project-by-project basis, generally<br>without a comprehensive approach.  | Continue with development of the Habitat<br>Preservation/Conservation Framework as a win-win<br>approach for selected geographic areas.  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Freight   | Forecasts show freight volume<br>through the ports tripling by 2040,<br>placing extreme demands on the<br>transportation system.  | Continue building out the freeway system,<br>interchanges, and grade separations. Work closely<br>with the private sector to understand changes in<br>technology and freight operations and how the<br>transportation system can best accommodate those<br>changes. Construct all the freight projects in the<br>California Freight Mobility Plan to the extent funding<br>allows. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Table VI-1: Summary of Long-Term Transportation and Sustainability Strategies, Continued

| Category                  | Challenge  | Strategy   |
|---------------------------|--|--|
| Functional Catego         | ries, Continued  |  |
| Health                    | Public health is being integrated into<br>policy frameworks throughout state,<br>regional, and local governments. The<br>challenge in the transportation arena<br>is to determine how to incorporate<br>health considerations into decision-<br>making frameworks. | Continue to build on health partnerships already<br>established. Continue focus on transit mobility and<br>developing the active transportation network to<br>promote cycling and walking.   |
| Transportation<br>revenue | The federal Highway Trust Fund and<br>state gasoline/diesel taxes continue to<br>lose purchasing power, resulting in<br>lower revenues for transportation<br>agencies and local jurisdictions.   | Provide input to regional and statewide discussions<br>and pilot projects on the generation of additional<br>revenue for transportation. Construct a set of<br>revenue generation options that can be evaluated<br>by the SANBAG Board, with input from a wide range<br>of stakeholders. |

## Table VI-1: Summary of Long-Term Transportation and Sustainability Strategies, Continued

# Looking to the Future

As the CTP is a living document, future iterations will incorporate emerging trends and strategies. Technology will continue to play a significant role in maximizing the efficiency of the transportation system and meeting air quality attainment standards and GHG reduction targets. Vehicle technology and fuel technology are key to improving air quality and reducing GHG throughout the region. As natural gas and hydrogen fuel cell technologies continue to gain momentum fueling and vehicle charging infrastructure must keep pace. Major auto manufacturers are developing autonomous vehicles, expecting to bring them to market within the next decade. Vehicle to vehicle communication technology is being developed to improve safety.

As the core transit system throughout the San Bernardino Valley matures, system growth must be supported by transit-oriented development to maximize effectiveness. While local jurisdictions are responsible for land use, growth in population and employment are difficult to forecast and manage efficiently. SANBAG must coordinate closely with local jurisdictions to ensure that transportation system investments efficiently serve the current and future population. Mixed-use developments in transit corridors or adjacent to multi-modal hubs offer travel choice options for pedestrians, cyclists and transit users.

Technology will play a role in the future of transit service through greater application of real-time data to optimize service. Electronic fare collection and fare integration between service agencies/providers have the potential to drastically change how service is provided and how transit service is utilized. Boarding and transfer times are reduced, thereby improving travel time and increasing the attractiveness of transit service to users.

SANBAG will continue to monitor emerging transportation trends, including technology, legislative, regulatory and funding opportunities. Strategies incorporated into the CTP will continually be evaluated and updated as appropriate to ensure the CTP is current and relevant.

# VI-7 Countywide Transportation Plan - FINAL

# VII. Acronym List

| AB       | Assembly Bill   |
|----------|---|
| ACE      | Alameda Corridor East   |
| ACT      | Association for Commuter Transportation   |
| ADA      | Americans with Disabilities Act   |
| ADT      | Average Daily Traffic   |
| AE       | Advance Expenditure   |
| AEA      | Advance Expenditure Agreement   |
| APTA     | American Public Transportation Association  |
| AQMP     | Air Quality Management Plan   |
| ARB      | Air Resources Board   |
| ARRA     | American Recovery and Reinvestment Act  |
| ATMIS    | Advanced Transportation Management Information Systems                              |
| BAT      | Barstow Area Transit  |
| BNSF     | Burlington Northern Santa Fe  |
| BRT      | Bus Rapid Transit   |
| CAC      | Call Answering Center   |
| CALACT   | California Association for Coordination Transportation                              |
| CALCOG   | California Association of Councils of Governments                                   |
| CALSAFE  | California Committee for Service Authorities for Freeway Emergencies                |
| Caltrans | California Department of Transportation   |
| CAP      | Climate Action Plan   |
| CARB     | California Air Resources Board  |
| CEQA     | California Environmental Quality Act  |
| CHP      | California Highway Patrol   |
| CMA      | Congestion Management Agency  |
| CMAQ     | Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality   |
| CMIA     | Corridors Mobility Improvement Account  |
| CMP      | Congestion Management Program   |
| CNG      | Compressed Natural Gas  |
| COG      | Council of Governments  |
| CPNA     | Capital Projects Needs Analysis   |
| CSAC     | California State Association of Counties  |
| CTA      | California Transit Association  |
| CTAA     |   |
| CTSA     | Community Transportation Association of America                                     |
| CTC      | Consolidated Transportation Services Agency<br>California Transportation Commission |
|          | -   |
| CTC      | County Transportation Commission  |
| CTP      | California Transportation Plan  |
| CTP      | Countywide Transportation Plan  |
| DAAS     | Department of Aging and Adult Services  |
| DIF      | Development Impact Fee  |
| DMO      | Data Management Office  |
| DOT      | Department of Transportation  |
| E&H      | Elderly and Handicapped   |
| EIR      | Environmental Impact Report   |
| EIS      | Environmental Impact Statement  |
| EPA      | United States Environmental Protection Agency                                       |
| ETC      | Employee Transportation Coordinator   |
| FEIS     | Final Environmental Impact Statement  |
| FHWA     | Federal Highway Administration  |

| FRA              | Federal Railroad Administration   |
|------------------|---|
| FSP              | Freeway Service Patrol  |
| FTA              | Federal Transit Administration  |
| FTIP             | Federal Transportation Improvement Program                              |
| GFOA             | Government Finance Officers Association                                 |
| GHG              | Greenhouse Gas  |
| GIS              | Geographic Information Systems  |
| HERO             | Home Energy Renovation Opportunity                                      |
| HOT              | High-Occupancy Toll   |
| HOV              | High-Occupancy Vehicle  |
| ICMA             | International City/County Management Association                        |
| ICTC             | Interstate Clean Transportation Corridor                                |
| IECS             | Inland Empire Commuter Services   |
| IEEP             | Inland Empire Economic Partnership                                      |
| ISTEA            | Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991                |
| ITOC             | Independent Taxpayer Oversight Committee                                |
| IIP/ITIP         | Interregional Transportation Improvement Program                        |
| ITS              | Intelligent Transportation Systems                                      |
| IVDA             | Inland Valley Development Agency  |
| JARC             | Job Access Reverse Commute  |
|                  | Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority                |
| LAIF<br>LNG      | Local Agency Investment Fund<br>Liquefied Natural Gas                   |
| LRTP             | Long-Range Transit Plan   |
| LTF              | Local Transportation Funds  |
| MAGLEV           | Magnetic Levitation   |
| MAGLEV<br>MAP-21 | Moving Ahead for Progress in the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century               |
| MARTA            | Mountain Area Regional Transportation Authority                         |
| MBTA             | Morongo Basin Transit Authority   |
| MDAB             | Mojave Desert Air Basin   |
| MDAQMD           | Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District                           |
| MDLS             | Mountain/Desert Local Street  |
| MDMLH            | Mountain/Desert Major Local Highway                                     |
| MDSDT            | Mountain/Desert Senior and Disabled Transit                             |
| MIS              | Major Investment Study  |
| MLH              | Major Local Highway   |
| MOU              | Memorandum of Understanding   |
| mph              | Miles per hour  |
| MPO              | Metropolitan Planning Organization                                      |
| MSRC             | Mobile Source Air Pollution Reduction Review Committee                  |
| MTP              | Metropolitan Transportation Plan  |
|                  | Needles Area Transit  |
|                  | National Environmental Policy Act                                       |
| NMTP<br>OA       | Non-Motorized Transportation Plan<br>Obligation Authority               |
| OCTA             | Orange County Transportation Authority                                  |
| OWP              | Overall Work Program  |
| PA               | Project Advancement   |
| PAA              | Project Advancement Agreement   |
| PA&ED            | Project Approval and Environmental Document                             |
| PASTACC          | Public and Specialized Transportation Advisory and Coordinating Council |
| PAYG             | Pay-As-You-Go   |
|                  |   |

| PDT          | Project Development Team  |
|--------------|---|
| PPM          | Planning, Programming and Monitoring Funds  |
| PSE          | Plans, Specifications and Estimates   |
| PSR          | Project Study Report  |
| PTA          | Public Transportation Account   |
| PTMISEA      | Public Transportation, Modernization, Improvement and Surface Enhancement Account |
| PUC          | Public Utilities Commission   |
| PVEA         | Petroleum Violation Escrow Account  |
| RCTC         | Riverside County Transportation Commission  |
| RDA          | Redevelopment Agency  |
| RFP          | Request for Proposal  |
| RIP          | Regional Improvement Program  |
| ROD          | Record of Decision  |
| RR           | Railroad  |
| RTAC         | Regional Transportation Agencies' Coalition                                       |
| RTIP         | Regional Transportation Improvement Program                                       |
| RTP/SCS      | Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy                     |
| RTPA         | Regional Transportation Planning Agencies   |
| SB           | Senate Bill   |
| SAFE         | Service Authority for Freeway Emergencies   |
| SAFETEA-LU   | Safe Accountable Flexible Efficient Transportation Equity Act- A Legacy for Users |
| SANBAG       | San Bernardino Associated Governments   |
| SCAB         | South Coast Air Basin   |
| SCAG         | Southern California Association of Governments                                    |
| SCAQMD       | South Coast Air Quality Management District                                       |
| SCRRA        |   |
|              | Southern California Regional Rail Authority                                       |
| SED          | Socioeconomic Data  |
| SHA          | State Highway Account   |
| SHOPP        | State Highway Operations and Protection Program                                   |
| SOV          | Single-Occupant Vehicle   |
| SRTS<br>SRTP | Safe Routes to School   |
|              | Short Range Transit Plan  |
| STAF<br>STIP | State Transit Assistance Funds  |
| STP          | State Transportation Improvement Program  |
| TAC          | Surface Transportation Program  |
|              | Technical Advisory Committee  |
| TCIF         | Trade Corridors Improvement Funds   |
| TCM          | Transportation Control Measure  |
| TCRP         | Traffic Congestion Relief Program   |
| TDA          | Transportation Development Act  |
| TEA          | Transportation Enhancement Activities   |
| TEA-21       | Transportation Equity Act for the 21 <sup>st</sup> Century                        |
| TIA          | Traffic Impact Analysis   |
| TMC          | Transportation Management Center  |
| TMEE         | Traffic Management and Environmental Enhancement                                  |
| TOC          | Traffic Operations Center   |
| TOPRS        | Transit Operator Performance Reporting System                                     |
| TSM          | Transportation Systems Management   |
| UP           | Union Pacific   |
| USFWS        | United States Fish and Wildlife Service   |
| VCTC         | Ventura County Transportation Commission  |
| VFI          | Valley Freeway Interchange  |

| VHD     | Vehicle Hours of Delay                                      |
|---------|---|
| VHT     | Vehicle Hours Traveled                                      |
| VMT     | Vehicle Miles Traveled                                      |
| VSDT    | Valley Senior and Disabled Transit                          |
| VTMS    | Valley Traffic Management Systems                           |
| VVATS   | Victor Valley Area Transportation Study                     |
| VVMLH   | Victor Valley Major Local Highway                           |
| VVLS    | Victor Valley Local Streets                                 |
| VVPDTMS | Victor Valley Project Development Traffic Management System |
| VVSDT   | Victor Valley Senior and Disabled Transit                   |
| VVTA    | Victor Valley Transit Authority                             |
| WRCOG   | Western Riverside Council of Governments                    |

# **VIII. Appendices**

- APPENDIX A Baseline Scenario Project Listing
- APPENDIX B Aggressive Scenario Project Listing

# Appendix A

**Baseline Scenario Project Listing** 

|             | APPENDIX A - Baseline Scenario |   |                  |                 |              |  |  |
|-------------|--------------------------------|---|------------------|-----------------|--------------|--|--|
| RTP/FTIP ID | Lead Agency                    | Description   | Year<br>Complete | Project<br>List | Project Cost |  |  |
|             | Adelanto                       | El Mirage Rd from SR 395 to 1 Mile east to Adelanto Rd and on Adelanto Rd from El Mirage Rd to 1 mile south - Auburn<br>Ave pave existing 2 lane road   | 2015             |                 | \$560        |  |  |
| 200049      | Apple Valley                   | Mojave River Bridge crossing from terminus of Yucca Loma Rd to terminus of Green Tree Blvd includes widening Yates<br>Rd 2 to 4 lanes from .24 mile north of Chinquapin to Fortuna - includes a bridge over the BNSF RR to Hesperia Rd                                    | 2016             | FTIP            | \$46,477     |  |  |
| 20110602    | Apple Valley                   | SR18 at Apple Valley Rd Intersection Realignment  | 2016             | FTIP            | \$4,650      |  |  |
|             | Apple Valley                   | Widen Navajo Rd from SR-18 to Thunderbird Rd from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2020             | RTP             | \$4,800      |  |  |
|             | Apple Valley                   | Widen Yucca Loma Rd from Apple Valley Rd to Navajo Rd from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2016             | FTIP            | \$6,500      |  |  |
|             | Apple Valley                   | Widen Yucca Loma Rd from western terminis of Yucca Loma Rd to Apple Valley Rd from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2017             | FTIP            | \$13,965     |  |  |
| 20150015    | Barstow                        | In Barstow: I-15/Morton St Interchange; construct new Interchange. Includes a 6 lane bridge over I-15, 2 through lanes each direction, construction of new 4 lane roadway from IC to Outlet Center Dr (PA&ED only)  | 2021             | FTIP            | \$43,000     |  |  |
| 200622      | Barstow                        | Lenwood Grade Separation - North of West Main St - construct 4-lane grade separation  | 2015             | FTIP            | \$31,590     |  |  |
|             | Barstow Transit                | Operating Expenses  | 2015             | FTIP            | \$24,900     |  |  |
| 20040701    | Barstow Transit                | Paratransit - Vehicles 22 Passenger Replacement   | 2015             |                 | \$533        |  |  |
| 4A07195     | Big Bear Lake                  | Intersection Signalization and Synchronization on Big Bear Blvd from West City Limits to East City Limits   | 2020             | RTP             | \$1,600      |  |  |
| 4A01025     | Big Bear Lake                  | Widen Big Bear Blvd from West Big Bear City Limits to East Big Bear City Limits from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2020             | RTP             | \$18,634     |  |  |
|             | CalTrans                       | Construct a new Vista Point at Route 138 with 10 parking spaces   | 2015             | FTIP            | \$575        |  |  |
| 35558       | CalTrans                       | Gateway Enhancements on I-15 from Mojave Dr. in Victorville to Stoddard Wells Rd in Barstow   | 2017             | FTIP            | \$2,446      |  |  |
| SBDLS07     | CalTrans                       | Grouped projects for bridge rehabilitation and reconstruction (No new capacity) - SHOPP Program   | 2020             | FTIP            | \$120,631    |  |  |
| SBDLS09     | CalTrans                       | Grouped projects for emergency response projects at various locations   | 2015             | FTIP            | \$10,956     |  |  |
| SBDLS02     |                                | Grouped projects for Pavement resurfacing and/or rehabilitation   | 2019             | FTIP            | \$234,459    |  |  |
| SBDLS14     | CalTrans                       | Grouped projects for pavement resurfacing and/or rehabilitation on the State Highway System   | 2016             | FTIP            | \$10,511     |  |  |
| SBDLS05     |                                | Grouped projects for safety improvements  | 2015             | FTIP            | \$9,402      |  |  |
| SBDLS01     | CalTrans                       | Grouped projects for safety improvements - SHOPP Collision Reduction Program  | 2019             | FTIP            | \$296,051    |  |  |
| SBDLS04     |                                | Grouped projects for safety improvements - SHOPP Mobility Program   | 2016             | FTIP            | \$3,616      |  |  |
| SBDLS011    | CalTrans                       | Grouped projects for safey improvements - SHOPP Mandates Program  | 2020             | FTIP            | \$20,314     |  |  |
| SBDLS03     | CalTrans                       | Grouped projects for shoulder improvements - SHOPP Roadside Preservation Program  | 2015             | FTIP            | \$16,961     |  |  |
| 35556       | CalTrans                       | I-15 - 0.5 miles north of Mojave Drive to 1.5 North of existing Stoddard Wells Road Overcrossing. Reconstruct D/E/Stoddard Wells Rd ICs. Construct new collector distributor road over D/E/and BNSF RR to parrallel I-15 NB, reconstruct/realign east/west frontage roads | 2017             | FTIP            | \$119,325    |  |  |
| 20061201    | CalTrans                       | I-15/I-215 interchange improvements   | 2017             | FTIP            | \$324,460    |  |  |
| SBD31850    | Caltrans                       | I-215 Barton Rd interchange reconstruction  | 2018             | FTIP            | \$78,600     |  |  |
| 4H01008     | Caltrans                       | I-215 from SR-210 to I-15, Add 1 HOV lane each direction  | 2035             |                 | \$179,335    |  |  |
| 0G841       | CalTrans                       | Install Interpretive displays at the C.V. Kane Safety Roadside Rest Area (SCRRA) near the City of Barstow   | 2015             | FTIP            | \$260        |  |  |
| 34770       | CalTrans                       | Kern Co Line to 7.5 miles east of US-395 junction - construct 4-lane expressway on new alignment, new interchange at US-395 and SR-58   | 2019             | FTIP            | \$194,838    |  |  |

|             | APPENDIX A - Baseline Scenario |   |                  |                 |              |  |  |  |
|-------------|--------------------------------|---|------------------|-----------------|--------------|--|--|--|
| RTP/FTIP ID | Lead Agency                    | Description   | Year<br>Complete | Project<br>List | Project Cost |  |  |  |
| 34040       | CalTrans                       | Realign & widen US-395 to a 6-lane freeway from I-15 to SR-18 (PH1) & 4-lane freeway from SR-18 to Purple Sage (PH 2)<br>& widen to 4-lane expressway from Purple Sage to 0.5 mi S/O Farmington Rd (PH 3). (PA&ED only) | 2020             | FTIP            | \$2,629      |  |  |  |
| 4351        | CalTrans                       | SR-58 Expressway-Realign and widen from 2 to 4 lane expressway. New interchanges at Lenwood Rd and Hinkley Rd. 2.4 miles west of Hidden River Rd to 0.7 miles east of Lenwood Road (Phase 2)                            | 2016             | FTIP            | \$194,925    |  |  |  |
| 4M07008     | Caltrans                       | SR-60: Widen aux lanes in each direction, widen connector from SB-15 to WB-60 and EB-60 to NB/SB-15, widen ramps from one to two lanes  | 2021             | RTP             | \$71,000     |  |  |  |
| 34042       | CalTrans                       | US 395 - new alignment construct 4-lane expressway from 1.8 miles south of Desert Flower Rd to 0.5 miles south of Farmington Rd (northerly alignment)   | 2020             | FTIP            | \$459,978    |  |  |  |
| 34013       | CalTrans                       | Widen 2 BNSF bridge structures on SR-138 1/2-mile west of I-15 from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2018             | FTIP            | \$13,550     |  |  |  |
| 34011       | CalTrans                       | Widen SR-138 from Phelan Rd to I-15 from 2 to 4 lanes with median   | 2016             | FTIP            | \$87,181     |  |  |  |
| 200452      | CalTrans                       | Widen US-395 from Chamberline Way to 1.8 miles S/O Desert Flower Rd as interim widening from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2019             | FTIP            | \$28,838     |  |  |  |
| 200453      | CalTrans                       | Widen US-395 from I-15 to SR-18 as interim widening from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2022             | FTIP            | \$7,223      |  |  |  |
| 200451      | CalTrans                       | Widen US-395 from SR-18 to Chamberlaine Way from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2019             | FTIP            | \$55,191     |  |  |  |
| 4A01026     | Chino                          | Widen Central Ave from Francis Ave to Riverside Dr from 6 to 8 lanes  | 2020             | RTP             | \$2,642      |  |  |  |
| 4A01266     | Chino                          | Widen Central Ave from Phillips Blvd to State St from 4 to 6 lanes  | 2020             | RTP             | \$2,093      |  |  |  |
| 4120104     |                                | Widen Central Ave from Riverside Dr to SR-71 from 4 to 6 lanes  | 2020             | RTP             | \$7,796      |  |  |  |
| 4A01028     | Chino                          | Widen Chino Ave from Central Ave to Mountain Ave from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2020             | RTP             | \$6,100      |  |  |  |
| 4A01030     | Chino                          | Widen Chino Ave from Fern Ave to Euclid Ave from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2020             | RTP             | \$4,043      |  |  |  |
| 4A07205     | Chino                          | Widen Chino Ave from Mountain Ave to Fern Ave from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2020             | RTP             | \$1,500      |  |  |  |
| 4A01062     | Chino                          | Widen Chino Hills Pkwy from Ramona Ave to Chino Creek Bridge from 4 to 6 lanes  | 2020             | RTP             | \$203        |  |  |  |
| 4A01033     | Chino                          | Widen Edison Ave from Pipeline Ave to Ramona Ave from 4 to 6 lanes  | 2020             | RTP             | \$2,907      |  |  |  |
| SBD031118   | Chino                          | Widen Edison Ave Ramona Ave to Central Ave from 4 to 6 lanes  | 2022             | FTIP            | \$2,000      |  |  |  |
| 4A04035     |                                | Widen Euclid Ave from Kimball Ave to Pine Ave from 4 to 8 lanes   | 2020             | RTP             | \$2,430      |  |  |  |
| 4A01272     | Chino                          | Widen Francis Ave from 0.11 miles w/o East End to 0.13 miles e/o Telephone Ave from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2020             | RTP             | \$5,255      |  |  |  |
| 4120100     | Chino                          | Widen Francis Ave from Snyder Ave to Benson Ave from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2020             | RTP             | \$507        |  |  |  |
| 4A01040     | Chino                          | Widen Merrill Ave from Euclid Ave to East Chino City Limit from 2 to 3 lanes (eastbound only)   | 2020             | RTP             | \$1,159      |  |  |  |
| 4A07329     | Chino                          | Widen Mountain Ave from Bickmore Ave to El Prado Rd from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2020             | RTP             | \$347        |  |  |  |
| 4A04045     | Chino                          | Widen Pine Ave from Euclid Ave to Hellman Ave from 2 to 6 lanes   | 2020             | RTP             | \$5,368      |  |  |  |
| 4A07303     | Chino                          | Widen Pipeline Ave from Walnut Ave to 0.25 miles n/o Walnut Ave from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2020             | RTP             | \$506        |  |  |  |
| SBD031152   | Chino                          | Widen Riverside Dr at San Antonio Flood Control Channel bridge from 4 to 6 lanes  | 2022             | FTIP            | \$20,000     |  |  |  |
| 200202      | Chino                          | widenChino Ave from Monte Vista Ave to Sixth St from 2 to 4 lanes and install signal at intersection of Chino Ave and Monte Vista Ave   | 2022             | FTIP            | \$584        |  |  |  |
| 201114      | Chino                          | Widening of Central Ave bridge crossing SR-60 to accommodate widening of ramps  | 2021             | FTIP            | \$16,445     |  |  |  |
| 200207      |                                | widenPine Ave Extension bridge from SR 71 to Euclid Ave in the City of Chino from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2021             | FTIP            | \$25,000     |  |  |  |
| 200401      | Chino Hills                    | Extend Fairfield Ranch Rd from Franch Rd to Pine Ave intersection - construct new 2 lane road with bike lanes   | 2017             | FTIP            | \$4,581      |  |  |  |
| 20083402    | Chino Hills                    | Widen Peyton Dr from Eucalyptus to SR-142 from 2 to 4 lanes with marked bike lanes in each direction  | 2014             | FTIP            | \$11,942     |  |  |  |
| 4A07116     | Chino Hills                    | Widen Pine Ave from SR-71 to Chino Creek (north side only) in conjunction with Chino Project ID 200207  | 2020             | RTP             | \$3,250      |  |  |  |

| RTP/FTIP ID | Lead Agency | Description  | Year<br>Complete | Project<br>List | Project Cos |
|-------------|-------------|--|------------------|-----------------|-------------|
| 201157      | Colton      | Construct new 4-lane roadway Washington St from 0.90 miles west of Mt. Vernon Ave to La Cadena Dr (PA&ED Only)   | 2018             | FTIP            | \$28,00     |
| 20110601    | Colton      | Replace La Cadena Dr 4 lane bridge over Santa Ana River, 1.5 miles south of I-10 with 6 lane bridge  | 2019             | FTIP            | \$27,53     |
| 200064      | Colton      | Washington St from Reche Canyon to Hunts Ln - Eliminate bottleneck by adding NB turn pocket at Reche Canyon Rd<br>(Exclusive Left and Right) through restriping and widening | 2016             | FTIP            | \$5         |
| 201158      | Colton      | Widen Agua Mansa from Rialto Channel to Rancho Ave from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2018             | FTIP            | \$6,6       |
| 4A04071     | Colton      | Widen Mt. Vernon Ave from La Cadena Dr to Eastbound I-10 Ramps from 4 to 6 lanes   | 2020             | RTP             | \$2,3       |
| 200856      | Colton      | Widen Mt. Vernon Bridge over UPRR from "M" St to I-10 on-ramp from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2019             | FTIP            | \$9,0       |
| 200843      | Colton      | Widen Reche Canyon Rd from 1.20 miles of S. Barton Rd to 0.42 miles south of Barton Rd from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2017             | FTIP            | \$5,6       |
| 20150302    | Fontana     | I-10 @ Beech Ave; Construct new 4-lane interchange (2 lanes each direction ) (PA&ED Only)  | 2023             | FTIP            | \$4         |
| 201139      | Fontana     | Construct 4-lane Casa Grande Ave from Lytle Creek Rd to Mango Ave  | 2021             | FTIP            | \$10,5      |
| 201143      | Fontana     | Construct 4-lane Duncan Canyon Rd from Citrus Ave to Sierra Ave  | 2020             | FTIP            | \$5,2       |
| SBD031227   | Fontana     | Construct 6-lane Jurupa Ave Etiwanda Ave to Sierra Ave   | 2016             | FTIP            | \$24,4      |
| 201142      | Fontana     | Construct new 2-lane Cypress Ave from Duncan Canyon Rd to Frontage Rd (I-15)   | 2021             | FTIP            | \$3,2       |
| 4A01104     | Fontana     | Construct new 4-lane I-15 Frontage Rd from Duncan Canyon Rd to Riverside Ave   | 2020             | RTP             | \$4,9       |
| 20131506    | Fontana     | San Sevaine Trail Connectivity; from just N of I-15/Cherry Ave IC along the San Sevaine Flood Control Basin S to County<br>Line (PA&ED ONLY)                                 | 2020             | FTIP            | \$1         |
| SBD031218   | Fontana     | Widen Alder Ave Baseline to Foothill Blvd from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2020             | FTIP            | \$2,6       |
| SBD031233   | Fontana     | Widen Arrow Blvd Alder to Maple Ave from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2019             | FTIP            | \$5,8       |
| 4120125     | Fontana     | Widen Arrow Blvd from Almeria Ave to Citrus Ave from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2020             | RTP             | \$1,2       |
| 4A07024     | Fontana     | Widen Arrow Blvd from Hickory Ave to Tokay Ave from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2020             | RTP             | \$5,9       |
| SBD031235   | Fontana     | Widen Arrow Hwy Almeria to Citrus Ave from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2023             | FTIP            | \$1,2       |
| 4A07066     |             | Widen Arrow Hwy from Alder Ave to Maple Ave from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2018             | RTP             | \$5,0       |
| SBD031217   | Fontana     | Widen Beech Ave Foothill to Miller Ave from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2020             | FTIP            | \$4,6       |
| 4A07185     | Fontana     | Widen Beech Ave from Arrow Rte to Foothill Blvd from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2020             | RTP             | \$1,7       |
| 4A07157     | Fontana     | Widen Beech Ave from Valley Blvd to Randall Ave from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2020             | RTP             | \$2,5       |
| 4A07048     | Fontana     | Widen Ceres Ave from Mango Ave to Catawba Ave from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2020             | RTP             | \$6,1       |
| 200409      | Fontana     | Widen Cherry Ave at SCRRA RR crossing bridge from 4 to 6 lanes on Cherry Ave over RR crossing (from Merrill St to Whittram Ave)  | 2015             | FTIP            | \$8,8       |
| 201107      | Fontana     | Widen Cherry Ave from south Highland Ave to I-15 from 2 to 6 lanes   | 2020             | FTIP            | \$2,6       |
| 4A07040     | Fontana     | Widen Cherry Ave from Valley Blvd to Foothill Blvd from 4 to 6 lanes   | 2020             | RTP             | \$7,7       |
| 20150005    | Fontana     | Widen Citrus Ave from Jurupa Ave to Slover Ave from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2020             | FTIP            | \$1,8       |
| 201140      | Fontana     | Widen Citrus Ave from Summit Ave to I-15 from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2021             | FTIP            | \$2,6       |
| 201141      | Fontana     | Widen Cypress Ave from Slover Ave to Jurupa Ave from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2018             | FTIP            | \$2,4       |
| 4120129     | Fontana     | Widen Duncan Canyon Rd from Citrus Ave to Sierra Ave from 0 to 4 lanes   | 2025             | RTP             | \$5,2       |
| 4120130     | Fontana     | Widen Duncan Canyon Rd from I-15 to Citrus Ave from 0 to 4 lanes   | 2025             | RTP             | \$1,3       |
|             | Fontana     | Widen Duncan Canyon Rd from I-15 to Citrus Ave from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2019             | FTIP            | \$1,3       |
| SBD031228   | Fontana     | Widen Etiwanda Ave Riverside County Line to I-10 from 4 to 6 lanes   | 2020             | FTIP            | \$2,6       |
| SBD031246   | Fontana     | Widen Foothill Blvd Citrus Ave to Maple Ave from 4 to 6 lanes  | 2021             | FTIP            | \$7,2       |
| 4A04102     | Fontana     | Widen Foothill Blvd from Hemlock Ave to Almeria Ave from 4 to 6 lanes  | 2020             | RTP             | \$7,        |

|             |               |   | Year     | Project |              |
|-------------|---------------|---|----------|---------|--------------|
| RTP/FTIP ID | Lead Agency   | Description   | Complete | List    | Project Cost |
| 201144      | Fontana       | Widen Jurupa Ave from Tamarind Ave to Alder Ave from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2020     | FTIP    | \$958        |
| SBD031254   | Fontana       | Widen Merrill Ave Alder Ave to Maple Ave from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2019     | FTIP    | \$2,065      |
| 4A04114     | Fontana       | Widen Merrill Ave from Catawba Ave to Fontana Ave from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2020     | RTP     | \$1,400      |
| 4A07055     | Fontana       | Widen Merrill Ave from Cherry Ave to Catawba Ave from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2020     | RTP     | \$5,77       |
| 4A07222     | Fontana       | Widen Randall Ave from Alder Ave to Cedar Ave from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2020     | RTP     | \$1,266      |
| 200835      | Fontana       | Widen San Bernardino Ave from Cherry Ave to Fontana City Limits (Lime Ave) from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2016     | FTIP    | \$4,06       |
| 4A07109     | Fontana       | Widen San Bernardino Ave from Etiwanda Ave to Cherry Ave from 4 to 6 lanes  | 2020     | RTP     | \$3,375      |
| SBD031266   | Fontana       | Widen Sierra Ave Foothill Blvd to Baseline Ave from 4 to 6 lanes  | 2021     | FTIP    | \$8,12       |
| 4A04123     | Fontana       | Widen Sierra Ave from Slover Ave to Valley Blvd from 6 to 8 lanes   | 2020     | RTP     | \$1,12       |
| 201146      | Fontana       | Widen Sierra Lakes Pkwy from Beech Ave to Citrus Ave from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2019     | FTIP    | \$4,29       |
| 201147      | Fontana       | Widen Slover Ave from Etiwanda Ave to 800 feet east of Etiwanda Ave from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2020     | FTIP    | \$2,09       |
| 201148      | Fontana       | Widen South Highland Ave from Cherry Ave to Citrus Ave from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2020     | FTIP    | \$5,25       |
| 201162      | Fontana       | Widen Valley Blvd from Beech Ave to Citrus Ave from 4 to 6 lanes  | 2021     | FTIP    | \$2,41       |
| 201149      | Fontana       | Widen Valley Blvd from Cherry Ave to Beech Ave from 4 ot 6 lanes  | 2021     | FTIP    | \$2,41       |
| 201163      | Fontana       | Widen Valley Blvd from Citrus Ave to Sierra Ave from 4 to 6 lanes   | 2021     | FTIP    | \$2,41       |
| 201164      | Fontana       | Widen Valley Blvd from Sierra Ave to Alder Ave from 4 to 6 lanes  | 2021     | FTIP    | \$72         |
| 4A07027     | Grand Terrace | Construct 4-lane Commerce Way extension from 900' n/o Pico St to Main St  | 2020     | RTP     | \$14,38      |
| 201106      | Grand Terrace | Construct 4-lane Commerce Way extension from Michigan Ave to Barton Rd at Vivienda Ave  | 2018     | FTIP    | \$1,55       |
| 4A01139     | Grand Terrace | Widen Barton Rd from Honey Hill Dr to NE Grand Terrace City Limits from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2018     | RTP     | \$2,53       |
| 4A01141     | Grand Terrace | Widen Barton Rd from I-215 to Southern Pacific RR from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2020     | RTP     | \$1,79       |
| 4A07356     | Grand Terrace | Widen Main St (WB Only) from SFRR to SPRR from 1 to 2 lanes   | 2020     | RTP     | \$22         |
| 201105      | Grand Terrace | Widen Michigan Ave from Commerce Way to Main St from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2019     | FTIP    | \$1,42       |
| 4A01146     | Grand Terrace | Widen Mt. Vernon Ave from Canal St to North Grand Terrace City Limits from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2018     | RTP     | \$57         |
| 4160007     | Hesperia      | Construct 6-lane interchange for I-15 @ Muscatel St   | 2023     | RTP     | \$21,10      |
| 4160006     | Hesperia      | Construct new interchange at I-15 @ Eucalyptus  | 2024     | RTP     | \$61,10      |
| 20084104    | Hesperia      | Joshua St Park & Ride Expansion - on Joshua St west of US-395, City of Hesperia, add 200 spaces   | 2016     | FTIP    | \$74         |
| 4A01147     | Hesperia      | Widen 7th Ave from Ranchero Rd to Bear Valley Rd from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2023     | RTP     | \$11,37      |
| 20150008    | Hesperia      | Widen and reconstruct Main St from I-15 to Maple (Phase 1)/Maple to 11th (Phase 2)/ I-15 to SR-395 (Phase 3) from 4 to 6 lanes, including widening of bridge over California Aqueduct                   | 2019     | FTIP    | \$17,95      |
| 4160038     | Hosporia      | Widen I Ave from Ranchero Rd to Main St from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2020     | RTP     | \$7,61       |
| 4160051     |               | Widen Ranchero Rd from Danbury Ave to Arrowhead Lake Rd from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2020     | RTP     | \$11,00      |
| 4160051     |               | Widen Ranchero Rd from Mariposa Rd to BNSF RR from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2022     | RTP     | \$15,00      |
| SBD55030    |               | Widen Ranchero Rd from Topaz Ave to 7th St from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2020     | FTIP    | \$13,00      |
| 4160052     | •             | Widen Ranchero Rd from Topaz Ave to 7th St from 2 to 5 lanes  | 2018     | RTP     | \$3,00       |
| SBD55026    |               | Widen/Reconstruct Eucalyptus St from I-15 to Peach Ave from 2 to 4 lanes and construct railroad crossing  | 2017     | FTIP    | \$20,00      |
| 20130306    | •             | Construct City Creek Levee Trails - non-motorized trails along the easterly and westerly city creek flood control levees  | 2013     | FTIP    | \$8,54       |
| 20061015    | Highland      | between Highland Ave and Base Line<br>Construct new 4-lane Greenspot Rd Bridge at Santa Ana River - existing bridge will be preserved and rehabilitated for<br>pedestrian, bicycle, and equestrian uses | 2015     | FTIP    | \$14,46      |

| APPENDIX A - Baseline Scenario |             |  |                  |                 |                  |  |  |  |
|--------------------------------|-------------|--|------------------|-----------------|------------------|--|--|--|
| RTP/FTIP ID                    | Lead Agency | Description  | Year<br>Complete | Project<br>List | Project Cost     |  |  |  |
|                                | Leau Agency | Palm Ave Historic District Improvements; Palm Ave (Base Line to Highland Ave) & Pacific St (Church Ave to 350 ft West of | complete         | LIJU            | Troject cost     |  |  |  |
| 20131503                       | Highland    | Palm) Shoulder improvements, new roundabout at Palm/Pacific Int, bike lanes (PA&ED Only)(Intersection                    | 2018             | FTIP            | \$79             |  |  |  |
| 20151505                       | Inginana    | improvements - no new lanes)   | 2010             |                 | ŢŢ               |  |  |  |
| 200019                         | Highland    | Reconstruct Base Line Bridge No. 54C0035 over City Creek (no new capacity)   | 2018             | FTIP            | \$22,810         |  |  |  |
|                                |             |  | 2010             |                 | <i>\$22,</i> 010 |  |  |  |
| 20130401                       | Highland    | Replace 2-lane Orange St Bridge No. 54C0592 over Plunge Creek Overflow, 1.5 miles N of Pioneer Ave with 4-lane bridge    | 2018             | FTIP            | \$4,630          |  |  |  |
|                                | Highland    | Shoulder and storm drain improvements on 3rd St from Victoria Ave to Palm Ave (remains 4 lanes)                          | 2018             | FTIP            | \$3,400          |  |  |  |
| 20131502                       | Highland    | Shoulder improvements on 5th St from Victoria Ave to Palm Ave (no additional lanes)(PA&ED Only)                          | 2017             | FTIP            | \$4,000          |  |  |  |
| 20150401                       | Highland    | Shoulder improvements on Del Rosa Dr from 3rd St to 5th St (non-capacity)  | 2020             | FTIP            | \$680            |  |  |  |
| 20150306                       | Highland    | Shoulder improvements on Pacific St from Palm Ave to Church Ave (non-capacity enhancing)                                 | 2017             | FTIP            | \$1,100          |  |  |  |
| 2011105                        | Highland    | Shoulder improvements Palm Ave from 3rd St to 5th St (No Widening)   | 2017             | FTIP            | \$818            |  |  |  |
| 2011104                        | Highland    | Shoulder improvements Victoria Ave from 3rd St to 6th St (No Widening)   | 2017             | FTIP            | \$3,075          |  |  |  |
| 2011151                        | utabla a d  | SR 210 @ 5th St/Greenspot Rd; On and Off Ramps widening; add lanes - Project adds 1 lane N/B to existing 2 lanes and     | 2017             | ETID            | éc 225           |  |  |  |
| 2011154                        | Highland    | adding 2 lanes to existing to lanes to N/B off ramp and adding 1 lane to Existing 2 lane S/B off ramp                    | 2017             | FTIP            | \$6,225          |  |  |  |
| 201186                         | Highland    | SR-210/Base Line IC: Reconstruct/widen Base Line between Church Ave and Boulder Ave from 4 to 6 lanes                    | 2021             | FTIP            | \$15,512         |  |  |  |
| 20121501                       | -           | Street and landscaping improvements on Boulder Ave from San Manuel Village Entrance to Greenspot Rd (non-capacity        | 2010             | FTID            | ća 500           |  |  |  |
| 20131501                       | Highland    | enhancements)  | 2018             | FTIP            | \$2,500          |  |  |  |
| 200213                         | Highland    | Widen 3rd St from Palm Ave to 5th St from 2 to 3 lanes and extend 3rd St easterly to connect 5th St                      | 2018             | FTIP            | \$1,571          |  |  |  |
|                                |             | Widen 5th St from City Creek to SR-210 from 4-6 lanes; Restripe SR-210 Undercrossing from 4 to 5 lanes between ramps     |                  |                 | 4= 0=0           |  |  |  |
| 201153                         | Highland    | with additional turn lane  | 2019             | FTIP            | \$5,070          |  |  |  |
| 201183                         | Highland    | Widen 5th St from Tippecanoe Ave to Del Rosa Dr from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2020             | FTIP            | \$5,255          |  |  |  |
| 4A07062                        | Highland    | Widen 9th St from Eucalyptus Dr to Victoria Ave from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2020             | RTP             | \$381            |  |  |  |
| 20082402                       |             | Widen Base Line between Church Ave and Seine Ave from 4 to 6 lanes (excluding freeway bridge over SR-210)                | 2020             |                 | \$1,200          |  |  |  |
| 201191                         | Highland    | Widen Base Line from Seine Ave to Stoney Creek Dr from 4 to 6 lanes  | 2021             | FTIP            | \$583            |  |  |  |
| SBD55033                       | 0           | Widen Boulder Ave from Greenspot to South City Limits from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2019             | FTIP            | \$2,350          |  |  |  |
|                                | Highland    | Widen Del Rosa Drive from 5th Street to 6th Street from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2021             | FTIP            | \$673            |  |  |  |
|                                | Highland    | Widen Greenspot Rd from Boulder Ave to Valencia Ct from 4 to 6 lanes   | 2022             | RTP             | \$1,798          |  |  |  |
|                                | Highland    | Widen Greenspot Rd from Gold Buckle Rd to Santa Ana River from 2 to 4 lanes (Excluding Bridge)                           | 2022             | RTP             | \$9,603          |  |  |  |
|                                | Highland    | Widen Greenspot Rd from Santa Paula St to south City Limit from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2020             | FTIP            | \$22,530         |  |  |  |
|                                | Highland    | Widen Sterling Ave from 3rd Street to 5th Street from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2018             |                 | \$400            |  |  |  |
|                                | Highland    | Widen Tippecanoe Ave from 3rd Street to 5th St from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2020             | FTIP            | \$798            |  |  |  |
|                                | Loma Linda  | Widen California St Barton Rd to Redlands Blvd from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2018             |                 | \$1,090          |  |  |  |
|                                | Loma Linda  | Widen Redlands Blvd at California St intersection and install traffic signals and drainage and curb and gutters          | 2016             |                 | \$6,000          |  |  |  |
| SBD41055                       |             | Bus System - Operating Assistance  | 2010             | FTIP            | \$21,548         |  |  |  |
|                                | MARTA       | Paratransit Vehicles - Replacement   | 2016             |                 | \$3,923          |  |  |  |
| 20150013                       |             | Rehab/Repair/Retrofit Transit Facilities   | 2010             |                 | \$729            |  |  |  |
| 20010120                       |             | Transit Service/Rehab Equipment - Purchase of various maintenance equipment  | 2015             |                 | \$63             |  |  |  |
| SBD31037                       |             | Bus System - Operating Assistance  | 2010             | FTIP            | \$21,933         |  |  |  |
| 20110104                       |             | Dispatch & Maintenance Office Equipment  | 2017             | FTIP            | \$85             |  |  |  |

|             |             |   | Year     | Project |              |
|-------------|-------------|---|----------|---------|--------------|
| RTP/FTIP ID | Lead Agency | Description   | Complete | List    | Project Cost |
| · · · ·     |             | Replace Cummins Engines at midlife to ensure they are kept in top performing order. The engine overhauls for 28-33  |          |         |              |
| 20110105    | MBTA        | passenger vehicles only.  | 2017     | FTIP    | \$180        |
| 20130601    | MBTA        | Replacement Buses Type 3 Class C. 18 pax CNG Vehicles   | 2017     | FTIP    | \$1,189      |
| 20010135    | Montclair   | Monte Vista @ UP RR Crossing - Grade Separation   | 2016     | FTIP    | \$20,262     |
| 20150001    | Montclair   | Widen Central Ave Bridge No. 54C0112 over UP RR Amtrak Metrolink from 4 to 6 lanes bridge with sidewalks  | 2020     | FTIP    | \$17,167     |
| SBD31612    | Needles     | Bus System - Operating Assistance   | 2016     | FTIP    | \$3,679      |
| R589TA      | Needles     | El Garces Station Multimodal Improvement Design   | 2016     | FTIP    | \$8,29       |
|             |             | I-40 Needles Connector: Roadway/Sidewalk improvements : J St from I-40 Off-ramps to W Broadway; W Broadway from   |          |         |              |
| 20112007    | Needles     | J St to Needles Hwy; Needles Hwy from W Broadway to N K St; N K St; N K St To S/Abutment of CO River Bridge   | 2017     | FTIP    | \$5,52       |
|             |             | Intersecton Improvements at J St/W Broadway, W Broadway/Needles Hwy, Needles Hwy/N K St   |          |         |              |
| SBD44003    | Needles     | Paratransit Vehicle Replacement   | 2017     | FTIP    | \$387        |
| SBD90105    | OmniTrans   | Bus System - Buses Bus Replacements Alt Fuel, 15 coaches per year   | 2015     | FTIP    | \$63,01      |
| SBD31084    | OmniTrans   | Bus System - Service Vehicles, purchase replacement service vehicles  | 2016     | FTIP    | \$2,86       |
| 20060601    | OmniTrans   | Capitalization of Leases - for Contractors, Radio, Sites, APC, Tire Leases  | 2016     | FTIP    | \$5,35       |
| 981122      | OmniTrans   | Capitalization of Preventive Maintenance  | 2016     | FTIP    | \$90,15      |
| 20080206    | OmniTrans   | Chino Transit Center Phase II - additional Bus Bays for future Inter-County routes  | 2016     | FTIP    | \$2,52       |
| 20061701    | OmniTrans   | Jobs Access and Reverse Commute Administration Operations and Capital Section 5316 various projects   | 2015     | FTIP    | \$5,22       |
| 20061901    | OmniTrans   | New Freedom Program Administration, operations and capital  | 2015     | FTIP    | \$1,39       |
| 20111201    | OmniTrans   | Operations of the access service  | 2018     | FTIP    | \$10,00      |
| 20060603    | OmniTrans   | Passenger Facilites San Bernardino Valley - Purchase equipment for stop and zone improvements   | 2015     | FTIP    | \$97         |
|             |             | Pedestrian & Bicycle Access Improvements within 1/2 mile of Rapid Transit Stations (Terminis at Pomona Downtown   |          |         |              |
| 20150109    | OmniTrans   | Metrolink Station & Kaiser Medical Center Fontana, following Holt Ave/Blvd, Archibald Ave, Milliken Ave, Foothill Blvd, &   | 2018     | FTIP    | \$25,12      |
|             |             | Sierra Ave)   |          |         |              |
|             | OmniTrans   | Replacement Paratransit vehicles replacing Paratransit Vehicles on Omnitrans Access Fleet   | 2015     | FTIP    | \$11,884     |
|             | OmniTrans   | Transit - Enhancement: 1% Transit Enhancements to increase accessibility to Bus Stops (ongoing)   | 2016     | FTIP    | \$1,74       |
|             | OmniTrans   | Transit - Facilities - Improvement/Upkeep of existing facilities  | 2015     | FTIP    | \$8,013      |
|             | OmniTrans   | Transit - Security capitalization of security costs   | 2016     |         | \$1,493      |
|             | OmniTrans   | Transit Administration Equipment purchase computer hardware & software  | 2016     |         | \$32,893     |
| 4A07227     |             | Construct 4-lane bridge on Francis St over West Cucamonga Creek   | 2017     | RTP     | \$10         |
| 4A07260     |             | Construct bridge on 6th St over Cucamonga Creek-Sidewalk only   | 2020     |         | \$74         |
| 4160002     |             | I-10 @ Vineyard Ave interchange widening from 4 to 6 lanes, widen on/off ramps  | 2030     | RTP     | \$84,00      |
|             | Ontario     | North Vineyard Ave UPRR Grade Separation between Holt Blvd and Airport Dr (no new capacity)   | 2017     | FTIP    | \$55,19      |
| 4160009     | Ontario     | Reconstruct SR-60 @ Grove Ave interchange   | 2040     | RTP     | \$51,00      |
| 200602      | Ontario     | Reconstruct SR-60 and Vineyard Ave interchange - lengthen bridge to accommodate Vineyard Ave widening from 4 to 6 lanes and ramp widening   | 2022     | FTIP    | \$7,62       |
| 2002160     | Ontario     | Relocate I-10 & 4th St IC to Grove Ave and widen Grove Ave between I-10 to Holt Blvd (4 to 6 lanes): Widen Grove Ave from State St to 350 ft N of Holt Blvd includding RR Bridge (4 to 6 lanes) (PA&ED) | 2025     | FTIP    | \$13,03      |
| 200/05      | Ontario     | S. Milliken Ave Grade Separation - On Milliken from UPR to North of Mission Blvd RR Grade Separation  | 2018     | FTIP    | \$81,980     |

|             | Γ                    | APPENDIX A - Baseline Scenario  |          |         | T             |
|-------------|----------------------|---|----------|---------|---------------|
|             |                      | Description   | Year     | Project | Duplicat Cont |
| RTP/FTIP ID | Lead Agency          | Description   | Complete | List    | Project Cost  |
| 200804      | Ontario              | South Archibald Ave grade separation (at Mission Blvd). Construct grade separtion at existing at-grade crossing south of Archibald Ave and the UPPR-Los Angeles Line. Widen from 2 to 6 Lanes                                     | 2023     | RTP     | \$57,932      |
| 201132      | Ontario              | SR-60 at Archibald Ave interchange widen on- and off-ramps (2 to 3 lanes each way) (non-capacity enhancing along<br>Archibald Ave)  | 2021     | FTIP    | \$7,900       |
| 200604      | Ontario              | io SR-60 at Grove Ave Interchange reconstruction and widen Grove Ave from 4 to 6 lanes  |          | FTIP    | \$7,621       |
| 4A04192     | Ontario              | Widen Bellegrave Ave from Sumner Ave to Milliken Ave (Hamner Ave) from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2020     | RTP     | \$11,869      |
| 4A04194     | Ontario              | Widen Chino Ave from Euclid to Milliken Blvd from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2020     | RTP     | \$15,211      |
| 4A01203     | Ontario              | Widen Francis St from Benson Ave to Campus Ave from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2017     | RTP     | \$3,225       |
| 20150201    | Ontario              | Widen Grove Ave from I-10 to Airport Dr (4 lanes) concurrent with I-10/ Grove Ave IC Project (2002160)  | 2025     | FTIP    | \$2,293       |
| 4A01210     | Ontario              | Widen Holt Blvd from Benson Ave to Vineyard Ave from 4 to 6 lanes   | 2020     | RTP     | \$9,746       |
| 4A01213     | Ontario              | Widen Jurupa St from Turner Ave to Hofer Ranch Rd from 2 to 6 lanes   | 2017     | RTP     | \$734         |
| 4A07233     | Ontario              | Widen Mission Blvd from Benson Ave to Milliken Ave from 4 to 6 lanes  | 2017     | RTP     | \$13,600      |
| 4120147     | Ontario              | Widen Mountain Ave from Brooks St to 6th St from 4 to 6 lanes   | 2018     | RTP     | \$6,449       |
| 4A07138     | Ontario              | Widen Philadelphia St from Vineyard Ave to Cucamonga Creek from 2 to 4 lanes, including bridge over Cucamonga Creek   | 2017     | RTP     | \$1,865       |
| 200048      | Rancho Cucamonga     | I-15 at Baseline Rd interchange improvement; widen Baseline Rd from 4 to 6 lanes, widen East Ave from 2 to 4 lanes, realign and widen SB and NB Diamond ramps from 1 to 2 lanes, add SB loop on ramp                              | 2016     | FTIP    | \$57,504      |
| 201137      | Rancho Cucamonga     | Intersection improvements at Foothill Blvd/Archibald Ave  | 2020     | RTP     | \$640         |
|             | Rancho Cucamonga     | Widen Arrow Route from Etiwanda to East Rancho Cucamonga City Limit from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2022     | RTP     | \$1,100       |
| 4120161     | Rancho Cucamonga     | Widen Arrow Rte from 500' ft e/o I-15 to 1300' e/o I-15 from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2017     | RTP     | \$1,107       |
| 4160029     | Rancho Cucamonga     | Widen Cherry Ave from South Rancho Cucamonga City Limits to Wilson Ave from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2021     | RTP     | \$830         |
| 20150004    | Rancho Cucamonga     | Widen Foothill Blvd (Old State Rte 66) between Grove Ave and San Bernardino Rd from 4 to 6 lanes  | 2017     | FTIP    | \$6,006       |
| 200035      | Redlands             | Construct Wabash Ave 4-lane road from 5th St to I-10 to match on and off ramps  | 2018     | FTIP    | \$950         |
| 20081704    | Redlands             | I-10/Alabama St and Redlands Blvd and Alabama St/Colton Ave intersection improvements - widen intersection approaches on all four legs of Redlands Blvd/Alabama St intersection. Realign Alabama St on North side of intersection | 2020     | FTIP    | \$13,317      |
| 20020202    | Redlands             | Redlands Park Once Program - New parking structure between Eureka St and 3rd St S/O Stuart Ave and N/O RR approximately 200 Spaces (Not PNR)  | 2020     | FTIP    | \$7,600       |
| 200432      | Redlands             | Signal and intersections improvements at I-10 and Ford St on-ramp   | 2018     | FTIP    | \$700         |
| 200419      | Redlands             | Widen Alabama St from 2 to 4 lanes from North city limits to 3,000 ft North Palmetto Ave  | 2017     | FTIP    | \$7,200       |
| 4A01248     | Redlands             | Widen Orange St from Lugonia Ave to North Redlands City Limits from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2025     | RTP     | \$11,027      |
| 201113      | Redlands             | Widen the east side of Orange St from Lugonia Ave to San Bernardino Ave   | 2016     | FTIP    | \$540         |
| 200603      | Rialto               | Remove and replace 5-lane Riverside Ave bridge over Metrolink and BNSFwith 7 lane bridge  | 2016     | FTIP    | \$37,935      |
| 200450      | Rialto               | Rialto Metrolink Station - Increase parking spaces from 225-775   | 2015     | FTIP    | \$3,356       |
| 4A07121     | Rialto               | Widen and reconstruct Baseline Ave from Maple Ave to Linden Ave from 3 to 4 lanes   | 2020     | RTP     | \$250         |
| SBD031361   | Rialto               | Widen Ayala Dr Baseline Rd to SR-210 from 2 lanes to 4 lanes  | 2015     | FTIP    | \$3,431       |
| SBD59023    | San Bernardino, City | Construct 4-lane Campus Pkwy extension from Kendall Dr to I-215 Fwy   | 2024     | FTIP    | \$22,000      |
| SBD59021    | San Bernardino, City | Construct State St 4-lane extension from Hanford St to Foothill Blvd  | 2020     | FTIP    | \$17,628      |
| SBD59204    | San Bernardino, City | I-215 @ University Pkwy interchange reconfiguration   | 2022     | FTIP    | \$23,998      |
| 20150012    | San Bernardino, City | Intersection improvements for Foothill Blvd (State Route 66) at Fourth  | 2016     | FTIP    | \$1,137       |

| RTP/FTIP ID | Lead Agency            | Description   | Year<br>Complete | Project<br>List | Project Cost |
|-------------|------------------------|---|------------------|-----------------|--------------|
|             | San Bernardino, City   | Replace 4-lane Mt Vernon Ave Bridge at BNSF with 4-lane bridge from 2nd St to 5th St  | 2018             | FTIP            | \$72,235     |
|             | San Bernardino, City   | Shoulder widening on 3rd St from Tippecanoe Ave to Leland/Norton Way and from Leland/Norton Way to Victoria Ave   | 2018             |                 | \$3,200      |
| SBD59019    | San Bernardino, City   | Widen 40th St from Acre Ln to Electric Ave from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2019             | FTIP            | \$3,264      |
|             | San Bernardino, City   | Widen 5th St from Sterling Ave to Victoria Ave from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2018             | FTIP            | \$5,800      |
|             | San Bernardino, City   | widen Alabama St from 3rd St to South city limits from 2 to 3 S/B lanes   | 2018             | FTIP            | \$1,078      |
|             | San Bernardino, City   | Widen H St from Kendall Dr to 40th St from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2018             | FTIP            | \$918        |
|             | San Bernardino, City   | Widen Kendall Dr from Cambridge Ave to Pine Ave from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2020             | RTP             | \$5,02       |
|             | San Bernardino, City   | Widen Kendall Dr from Palm Ave to Cajon Blvd from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2020             | RTP             | \$5,216      |
|             | San Bernardino, City   | Widen Mt View Ave Bridge at Mission Creek Channel to 4 lanes (2 in each direction)  | 2015             | FTIP            | \$1,655      |
|             | San Bernardino, City   | Widen Mt View Ave Bridge/Culvert at Mission Creek Channel and extend bridge at Mt View Ave from 1 to 2 lanes; new bridge at-grade RR Crossing (SB only)   | 2020             | RTP             | \$1,440      |
| SBD41316    | San Bernardino, City   | Widen Mt View Ave Railway Grade Crossing from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2016             | FTIP            | \$1,58       |
| 200609      | San Bernardino, City   | Widen/extend Mt View Ave from 2 to 4 lanes (SB only) from Coulston Ave to Riverview Dr (South of Santa Ana River)   | 2016             | FTIP            | \$7,500      |
| 20150009    | San Bernardino, County | Construct and extend Shadow Mt Rd from Helendale Rd East to Nth from 2 to 4 lanes including 4 lane bridge over<br>Mojave River & Grade Separation over rail tracks with additional connect to Vista Rd on W side of tracks (PA&ED Only) | 2019             | FTIP            | \$3,970      |
| 20150002    | San Bernardino, County | Construct paved 2-lane Duncan Rd from Wilson Ranch Rd to Baldy Mesa   | 2016             | FTIP            | \$6,600      |
| 4A07051     | San Bernardino, County | Construct paved 2-lane Wilson Ranch Rd from Duncan Rd to Palmdale Rd  | 2023             | RTP             | \$6,00       |
| 200408      | San Bernardino, County | Extend Cumberland Dr from SH-18 North to Cumberland Dr as 2-lane road   | 2020             | FTIP            | \$3,00       |
| 20040826    | San Bernardino, County | Glen Helen Pkwy at UPRR and BNSF - Grade Separation   | 2015             | FTIP            | \$25,88      |
| 20130102    | San Bernardino, County | I-10/Pepper Ave bridge - widen from 3 to 5 lanes to provide for one additional through lane, one additional southbound turn lane and construct minor ramp improvements, minor arterial street improvements                              | 2017             | FTIP            | \$7,67       |
| SBD41339    | San Bernardino, County | I-10/Pepper interchange - widen bridge from 5 to 6 lanes to provide additional southbound turn lane   | 2016             | FTIP            | \$39,81      |
| 20150102    | San Bernardino, County | Pavement Preservation/Rehabilitation Morongo Basin-Joshua Tree Area Roads: Yucca Trail, Alta Loma Dr, Quail Springs<br>Rd, Aberdeen Dr, Park Blvd   | 2016             | FTIP            | \$1,834      |
| SBD031426   | San Bernardino, County | Realign, rehabilitate Needles Hwy from N St to Nevada State Line  | 2021             | FTIP            | \$13,47      |
| 200810      | San Bernardino, County | Replace 2-lane Baker Blvd Bridge over Mojave River, 0.2 miles SW of Death Valley Rd with 4-lane bridge  | 2018             | FTIP            | \$13,51      |
| 200619      | San Bernardino, County | Replace 2-lane Glen Helen Pkwy bridge at Cajon Creek with 4-lane bridge   | 2017             | FTIP            | \$28,30      |
| 20110603    | San Bernardino, County | Replace Rock Springs Rd 2-lane low water crossing of Mojave River, 0.9 miles East Arrowhead Lake Rd, with new 4 lane bridge   | 2020             | FTIP            | \$16,56      |
| 20130402    | San Bernardino, County | Restripe existing structural section of Baker Blvd between I-15 ramps and SH 127 from 2 to 4 lane configuration in conjunction with project to replace existing 2 lane bridge 54CO127 with 4 lane bridge                                | 2016             | FTIP            | \$25         |
| 4A07020     | San Bernardino, County | Safety upgrades to National Trails Highway in San Bernardino County   | 2020             | RTP             | \$12,000     |
| 4120193     | San Bernardino, County | Various Traffic Signal Projects Throughout San Bernardino County  | 2023             | RTP             | \$51,99      |
| 4A07322     | San Bernardino, County | Widen Alder Ave from Jurupa Ave to 0.12 miles n/o Jurupa Ave from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2023             | RTP             | \$40         |
|             | San Bernardino, County | Widen Bear Valley Rd Cutoff from Joshua Rd to SR-18 from 2 to 6 lanes   | 2023             | RTP             | \$600,60     |
| 4A07104     | San Bernardino, County | Widen Beech Ave from Randall Ave to Arrow Route from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2020             | RTP             | \$3,47       |
| 4A07125     | San Bernardino, County | Widen Devore Rd from I-215 to Kenwood Dr from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2023             | RTP             | \$3,60       |

|             |                        |   | Year     | Project |              |
|-------------|------------------------|---|----------|---------|--------------|
| RTP/FTIP ID | Lead Agency            | Description   | Complete | List    | Project Cost |
| •           | San Bernardino, County | Widen Devore Rd from Kenwood Dr to Foothill Dr from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2023     | RTP     | \$654        |
|             | San Bernardino, County | Widen El Rivino Rd from Cedar Ave to Agua Mansa Rd from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2023     | RTP     | \$4,185      |
|             | San Bernardino, County | Widen Emerald Rd from Palmdale Rd to Seneca Rd from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2020     | RTP     | \$1,485      |
|             | San Bernardino, County | Widen Glen Helen Pkwy from Lytle Creek Rd to I-15 from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2023     | RTP     | \$2,283      |
| 4A07299     | San Bernardino, County | Widen Jurupa Ave from Lilac Ave to Willow Ave from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2023     | RTP     | \$540        |
| 4A07165     | San Bernardino, County | Widen Jurupa Ave from Locust Ave to Cedar Ave from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2023     | RTP     | \$2,228      |
| 4A01278     | San Bernardino, County | Widen Phelan Rd from Sheep Creek Rd to Baldy Mesa Rd from 2 to 6 lanes  | 2020     | RTP     | \$24,79      |
| 200815      | San Bernardino, County | Widen Ranchero St from Mariposa to Hesperia CL from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2020     | FTIP    | \$12,450     |
| 4A07079     | San Bernardino, County | Widen San Bernardino Ave from Laurel Ave to Rialto City Limits from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2023     | RTP     | \$3,06       |
| 4A07132     | San Bernardino, County | Widen Santa Ana Ave from Cedar Ave to Cactus Ave from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2023     | RTP     | \$2,268      |
| 4A07159     | San Bernardino, County | Widen Santa Ana Ave from Locust Ave to Cedar Ave from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2023     | RTP     | \$1,744      |
| 4A01284A    | San Bernardino, County | Widen Sierra Ave from I-15 to Lytle Creek Rd from 2 to 4 lanes (currently is 2 NB/1 SB, widen to 2 lanes each direction)  | 2020     | RTP     | \$679        |
| 20150010    | San Bernardino, County | Widen Slover Ave from Tamarind Ave to Alder/Linden Ave to Cedar Ave from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2016     | FTIP    | \$2,57       |
| 4A07043     | San Bernardino, County | Widen Spring Valley Pkwy from Huerta Rd to Driftwood Dr from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2020     | RTP     | \$7,42       |
| 4A07218     | San Bernardino, County | Widen Valley Blvd from Commerce Dr to Almond Ave from 4/5 to 6 lanes (3 lanes each direction)   | 2020     | RTP     | \$1,31       |
| 200837      | San Bernardino, County | Widen Vista Rd from 2 to 4 lanes and construct grade separation   | 2020     | FTIP    | \$50,00      |
| 4A07235     | San Bernardino, County | Widen Wabash Ave from 0.30 miles s/o 7th St to 0.13 miles n/o 7th St from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2020     | RTP     | \$10         |
| 4A07321     | San Bernardino, County | Widen Wabash Ave from 6th Ave to 5th Ave from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2023     | RTP     | \$35         |
| 20150103    | San Bernardnio, County | Resurface Needles Hwy from 600 North of Balboa Pl to N St   | 2017     | FTIP    | \$58         |
| 20150108    | SANBAG                 | Bicycle and Pedestrian Accessibility improvements at Metrolink Stations (Montclair, Upland, Rancho Cucamonga,<br>Fontana, Rialto, and San Bernardino) Phase I.  | 2021     | FTIP    | \$4,67       |
| 20110109    | SANBAG                 | Construct new railroad grade-separated crossing between Laurel St and the BNSF Railroad in the City of Colton (No new capacity)   | 2015     | FTIP    | \$59,85      |
| 20150307    | SANBAG                 | Countyide Vanpool Project (Demonstration Project)   | 2016     | FTIP    | \$4,000      |
| 4TL104      | SANBAG                 | Countywide Local Transit Service Operations   | 2040     | RTP     | \$2,333,11   |
| 4122001     | SANBAG                 | Double tracking of Metrolink San Bernardino Line between CP Lilac and CP Rancho in San Bernardino County  | 2025     | RTP     | \$64,00      |
| 4TR0101     | SANBAG                 | Extend Metrolink rail service from Rialto/E St in San Bernardino to Redlands  | 2020     | RTP     | \$242,00     |
| SBD031505   | SANBAG                 | Grouped projects for LTF Article 3 Projects LTF, Article 3 Bicycle/Pedestrian Projects  | 2015     | FTIP    | \$14,72      |
| 20159907    | SANBAG                 | I-10 @ Alabama St interchange - Widen overcrossing from 4 to 6 lanes and reconfigure ramps  | 2024     | FTIP    | \$41,71      |
| 20159906    | SANBAG                 | I-10 @ Monte Vista Ave interchange - Widen Undercrossing from 4 to 6 lanes and ramp improvements  | 2021     | FTIP    | \$30,19      |
| 4120199     | SANBAG                 | I-10 @ Mountain View Ave interchange improvements   | 2040     | RTP     | \$51,00      |
| 44811       | SANBAG                 | I-10 @ Tippecanoe interchange add Eastbound off-ramp auxiliary lane from Waterman on-ramp to Tippecanoe off ramp<br>and widen bridge (non-capacity)   | 2015     | FTIP    | \$21,50      |
| 20131504    | SANBAG                 | I-10 @ University St Interchange: Intersection improvements with on/off ramp widening (No capacity enhancements)  | 2019     | FTIP    | \$5,10       |
| 20159902    | SANBAG                 | I-10 Corridor Express Lane widening (Phase 1): From San Antonio Ave to I-10/I-15 IC; 4 general purpose and 2 express<br>lanes in each direction   | 2022     | FTIP    | \$524,27     |
| 20159903    |                        | I-10 Corridor Express Lane Widening (Phase 2): Implement 2 express lanes in each direction from I-10/I-15 Interchange to California St and 1 express lane in each direction from California St to Ford St in Redlands | 2024     | FTIP    | \$1,064,44   |

| RTP/FTIP ID | Lead Agency | Description  | Year<br>Complete | Project<br>List | Project Cos |
|-------------|-------------|--|------------------|-----------------|-------------|
| SBD031279   | SANBAG      | I-15 @ Ranchero Rd - Construct 6-lane interchange  | 2015             | FTIP            | \$64,34     |
| 4M01041     | SANBAG      | I-15 @ Sierra Ave interchange improvements   | 2030             | RTP             | \$21,28     |
| 4122007     | SANBAG      | I-15 Express Lane Addition Express Lanes - add 2 Express Lanes in each direction (Segment 4)   | 2030             | RTP             | \$570,0     |
| 4160005     | SANBAG      | I-15 Express Lane Addition from SR-210 to I-15/I-215 Interchange - add 2 Express Lanes in each direction (Segment 3)   | 2026             | RTP             | \$150,0     |
| 4160008     | SANBAG      | I-15 Express Lane Addition from US-395 to High Desert Corridor - add 1 Express Lane in each direction (Segment 5)  | 2034             | RTP             | \$140,0     |
| 20159901    | SANBAG      | I-15 Express Lanes - add 2 Express Lanes in each direction from Cantu Galleano Rd to SR-210 and 1 Express Lane each direction from SR-210 to Duncan Canyon Rd                    | 2022             | FTIP            | \$350,0     |
| 4M01043     | SANBAG      | I-215 @ Mt Vernon Ave/Washington Ave interchange improvements  | 2035             | RTP             | \$109,0     |
| 200614      | SANBAG      | I-215 Bi-County HOV Lane Gap Closure - Add 1 HOV lane in each direction from Spruce St on SR-91 to Orange Show Rd  | 2015             | FTIP            | \$182,8     |
| 4M0803      | SANBAG      | I-215 Bi-County Improvement Project - Add 1 mainline lane in each direction  | 2035             | RTP             | \$250,0     |
| 4120222     | SANBAG      | Light rail extended from County Line to Montclair (Phase 2B)   | 2035             | RTP             | \$156,3     |
| 20061009    | SANBAG      | Metrolink - Sealed Corridor - San Gabriel Subdivision - comprehensive Corridor Safety Enhancement Program along<br>SANBAG owned ROW  | 2016             | FTIP            | \$4,5       |
| 990602      | SANBAG      | Metrolink Capital Maintenance - Rehabilitation/Renovation of Metrolink equipment including purchase of 20 Tier-4<br>Locomotives  | 2015             | FTIP            | \$37,8      |
| SBD41109    | SANBAG      | Metrolink Operating Assistance Southern California Regional Rail Authority   | 2016             | FTIP            | \$61,9      |
| 20150016    | SANBAG      | Metrolink Rolling Stock - SANBAG's share of purchase of Metrolink Cars & locomotives up to 47 Cars/Cabs and 8 locomotives  | 2015             | FTIP            | \$3,0       |
| 2011151     | SANBAG      | Mojave Desert Air Basin Rideshare Program  | 2015             | FTIP            | \$3,7       |
| 4122003     | SANBAG      | On I-10 construct easbound truck climbing lane from Live Oak Canyon Rd to Singleton Rd including transition between county line and Calimesa Blvd                                | 2023             | RTP             | \$50,0      |
| 200850      | SANBAG      | Palm Ave Grade Separation (No additional capacity)   | 2015             | FTIP            | \$26,3      |
| 20061012    | SANBAG      | Passenger Rail from San Bernardino Metrolink Station to new transit station at Rialto Ave and E St in Downtown San<br>Bernardino   | 2015             | FTIP            | \$83,       |
| 4RL04       | SANBAG      | Rideshare  | 2020             | RTP             | \$1,6       |
| 2011150     | SANBAG      | South Coast Air Basin Rideshare Program  | 2015             | FTIP            | \$6,5       |
| 4M07007     | SANBAG      | SR-210 @ Baseline Ave interchange improvements   | 2020             | RTP             | \$15,6      |
| 20110110    | SANBAG      | SR-210 @ Pepper interchange improvements - Construct new diamond interchange and widen Pepper Ave from 2 to 4 lanes from Highland Ave to existing 4 lane section S/O interchange | 2016             | FTIP            | \$23,       |
| 4M01049     | SANBAG      | SR-210 @ Waterman Ave interchange improvements   | 2040             | RTP             | \$51,0      |
| 20084106    |             | SR-210 Landscaping Segments 8-11 from Sierra Ave to SR-210/I-215   | 2015             | FTIP            | \$8,4       |
| 20111625    |             | SR-210 Lane Addition - Add 1 Mixed Flow lane in each direction from Highland Ave to San Bernardino Ave   | 2021             | FTIP            | \$132,2     |
|             | SANBAG      | SR-60 @ Euclid Ave interchange improvements  | 2040             | RTP             | \$6,0       |
| 4PL07019    |             | SR-60 @ Mountain Ave interchange reconstruction  | 2027             | RTP             | \$15,0      |
| 4120202     | SANBAG      | SR-60 @ Ramona Ave interchange reconstruction  | 2027             | RTP             | \$30,0      |
|             | SANBAG      | Widen US-395 from I-15 to SR-18 (Palmdale Rd) from 2 to 6 lanes or 4 to 6 lanes  | 2035             | RTP             | \$40,0      |
|             | SCRRA       | Service Expansion; SB Line 50 daily trains, Riverside line 46 daily trains, IEOC line 28 daily trains  | 2030             | RTP             | \$20,0      |

|             |                  |   |          | Project |              |
|-------------|------------------|---|----------|---------|--------------|
| RTP/FTIP ID | Lead Agency      | Description   | Complete | List    | Project Cost |
| SBD41427    | Twentynine Palms | Construct new 2-lane Amboy Rd from Lear Ave to Adobe Rd (PA&ED Only)  | 2021     | FTIP    | \$40         |
| 201103      | Upland           | Foothill Blvd Bottleneck and Safety Improvements from Central Ave to Grove Ave  | 2021     | FTIP    | \$5,300      |
| 4160003     | Upland           | I-10 @ Euclid Ave interchange reconstruction  | 2030     | RTP     | \$9,003      |
| SBD88086    | Upland           | Storm Drain Extension on Euclid Ave from D St to Foothill Blvd  | 2024     | FTIP    | \$4,250      |
| 20040825    | Upland           | Upland Metrolink Station - Additional Parking from 200 to 500 spaces  | 2013     | FTIP    | \$3,665      |
| 201101      | Upland           | Widen Arrow Route from Monte Vista Ave to Central Ave from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2018     | FTIP    | \$2,200      |
| 4A01296     | Upland           | Widen Central Ave from Foothill Blvd to Benson Ave from 0 to 4 lanes  | 2020     | RTP     | \$14,363     |
| 20131103    | Various Agencies | Grouped Projects for Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilites funded by Recreational Trails Program   | 2016     | FTIP    | \$1,267      |
| SBDLS08     | Various Agencies | Grouped Projects for Bridge Rehabilitation and Reconstruction - HBP Program   | 2018     | FTIP    | \$133,297    |
| 20131301    | Various Agencies | Grouped Projects for Operating Assistance to Transit Agencies   | 2015     | FTIP    | \$356        |
| 20150106    | Various Agencies | Grouped Projects for Safety Improvements (Regional): Safe Routes to School Program (SRTS)   | 2017     | FTIP    | \$8,416      |
| 20150104    | Various Agencies | Grouped Projects for Safety Improvements (State): Safe Routes to School Programs (SR2S)   | 2017     | FTIP    | \$2,122      |
| 1830        | Various Agencies | I-10 @ Cedar Ave interchange reconstruction between Slover Ave and Valley Blvd - widen from 4 to 6 lanes  | 2019     | FTIP    | \$62,930     |
| 44812       | Various Agencies | I-10 @ Tippecanoe reconfigure interchange (Westbound - Phase II)  | 2015     | FTIP    | \$58,906     |
| SBD41446    | Various Agencies | I-15 @ Eucalyptus - construct 6 lane standard interchange   | 2024     | FTIP    | \$61,100     |
| 201111      | Victorville      | Bridge rehab on National Trails Hwy and Mojave River  | 2018     | FTIP    | \$1,375      |
| SBD97147    | Victorville      | Construct 4-lane Green Tree Blvd Bridge at AT&SF & connect to Ridgecrest Rd   | 2020     | FTIP    | \$40,098     |
| 20131101    | Victorville      | Mojave Riverwalk: Construct a 9.5 mile (Class I, II, III) Bike and Ped Path connecting the Victor Valley Transportation Center (6th St), Mojave Narrows Regional Park (Yates Rd) and Victor Valley College (Bear Valley Rd) | 2018     | FTIP    | \$3,050      |
| 200416      | Victorville      | SCLA Rail Service from Air Expressway approx 5 miles N/O to Colusa Rd between Phantom East & Mojave River - New freight Rail Line from BNSF to SCLA in connection with new intermodal/multimodal facility at SCLA           | 2019     | FTIP    | \$250,000    |
| SBD031422   | Victorville      | Widen 3rd Ave Nisqualli Rd to Green Tree Blvd from 2 lanes to 4 lanes   | 2023     | RTP     | \$750        |
|             | Victorville      | Widen 6-lane Bear Valley Rd Bridge No 54C0547 over BNSF/UPRR to 7-lane bridge and seismic retrofit  | 2018     | FTIP    | \$5,849      |
| 4A07170     | Victorville      | Widen Aster Rd from Mojave Dr to Cactus Rd from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2020     | RTP     | \$2,025      |
| 4A07348     | Victorville      | Widen Monte Vista Rd (Aster Rd) from Bear Valley Rd to Sycamore Rd from 0 to 4 lanes  | 2020     | RTP     | \$2,000      |
| 201179      | Victorville      | Widen National Trails Hwy between I-15 & Air Expressway from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2017     | FTIP    | \$4,000      |
| 4A07025     | Victorville      | Widen National Trails Hwy Bridge over Mojave River (replace existing bridge) widen 2 from to 4 lanes  | 2035     | RTP     | \$10,000     |
| 20130302    | VVTA             | Bus Rehabilitation  | 2015     | FTIP    | \$885        |
| SBD41084    | VVTA             | Bus System - Buses Replacement - Alt Fuel   | 2015     | FTIP    | \$10,520     |
| SBD31581    | VVTA             | Bus System - Operating Assistance   | 2016     | FTIP    | \$82,154     |
| 200086      | VVTA             | Bus System - Passenger Facilities   | 2019     | FTIP    | \$1,175      |
| SBD41117    | VVTA             | Bus System - Purchase Service Vehicles  | 2016     | FTIP    | \$780        |
| 20111805    | VVTA             | Buses - Rehabilitation/Improvements - Spare Parts/Associated Capital Maintenance Items  | 2016     | FTIP    | \$47         |
| 20110302    |                  | Capital - Bus Facility - Capital Lease Payments   | 2016     | FTIP    | \$29,439     |
| 20131102    |                  | Commuter Bus Replacement  | 2015     |         | \$4,000      |
| 20111808    | VVTA             | Inland Empire Vanpool Program - Victor Valley Phase Livability Grant  | 2015     |         | \$1,864      |
| 20061704    |                  | Jobs Access Reverse Commute (JARC) Various Projects to increase access to jobs for low income individuals, including voucher programs and vanpools  | 2015     | FTIP    | \$1,282      |

|             |              |   | Year     | Project |              |
|-------------|--------------|---|----------|---------|--------------|
| RTP/FTIP ID | Lead Agency  | Description   | Complete | List    | Project Cost |
| SBD41114    | VVTA         | Paratransit - Vehicle Replacement Alt Fuel  | 2014     | FTIP    | \$3,543      |
| 20150101    | VVTA         | Paratransit Vehicle Expansion   | 2015     | FTIP    | \$245        |
| 20111815    | VVTA         | Preventative Maintenance Operating Assistance   | 2014     | FTIP    | \$12,306     |
| 20112006    | VVTA         | Purchase 3 Expansion 40' Buses Alt Fuel   | 2015     | FTIP    | \$1,800      |
| 981104      | VVTA         | Transit - Security  | 2016     | FTIP    | \$1,135      |
| 20111806    | VVTA         | Transit Bus Stop Access Improvements - Path of Travel for existing Bus Stop   | 2017     | FTIP    | \$173        |
| 20110301    | VVTA         | Transit Operating Equipment - ITS Software/Hardware   | 2017     | FTIP    | \$916        |
| 20150303    | Yucaipa      | Rehab Wildwwod Canyon Rd From Oakview to Oakgrove, and from 100 ft East & West of Oakgrove (non-capacity enhancing)     | 2015     | FTIP    | \$500        |
| 2011157     | Yucaipa      | Widen Avenue E from Bryant St to 5th St from 2 to 4 lanes (Phased Project)  | 2015     | FTIP    | \$3,174      |
| 4A07304     | Yucaipa      | Widen Bryant St from North Yucaipa City Limits to SR-38 from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2023     | RTP     | \$568        |
| 2011155     | Yucaipa      | Widen Yucaipa Blvd from 15th St to I-10 Freeway from 4-6 lanes  | 2018     | FTIP    | \$7,250      |
| 20150301    | Yucca Valley | SR-62 Traffic Control Synchronization: 10 Traffic signals from SR-62/Sage Ave through SR-62/Yucca Mesa - La Cantenta Rd | 2016     | FTIP    | \$227        |
|             |              |   |          | Total   | \$13,467,680 |

| FTIP  | \$7,547,981  |
|-------|--------------|
| RTP   | \$5,933,642  |
| Total | \$13,481,623 |

# **Appendix B**

Aggressive Scenario Project Listing

|             |              |  | Year     | Project |              |
|-------------|--------------|--|----------|---------|--------------|
| RTP/FTIP ID | Lead Agency  | Description  | Complete | List    | Project Cost |
| 4A04406     | Adelanto     | Construct 4-lane Adelanto Rd from Chamberlaine Way to Colusa Rd              | 2040     | RTP     | \$9,000      |
| 4A04409     | Adelanto     | Construct 4-lane Koala Rd from Palmdale Rd to Holly Rd                       | 2040     | RTP     | \$4,000      |
| 4120001     | Adelanto     | Widen Adelanto Rd from Holly to Chamberlaine Way from 2 to 4 lanes           | 2025     | RTP     | \$12,000     |
| 4120008     | Adelanto     | Widen Air Expy from Jonathan Ave to Lessing Rd from 2 to 4 lanes             | 2035     | RTP     | \$16,000     |
| 4120009     | Adelanto     | Widen Amethyst Rd from Holly Rd to Rancho Rd from 2 to 4 lanes               | 2040     | RTP     | \$2,298      |
| 4120012     | Adelanto     | Widen Aster Rd from Palmdale to Oleander Rd from 0 to 4 lanes                | 2040     | RTP     | \$15,000     |
| 4120018     | Adelanto     | Widen Bartlett Ave from Adelanto to Caughlin Rd from 2 to 4 lanes            | 2040     | RTP     | \$12,00      |
| 4120023     | Adelanto     | Widen Beaver Rd from Palmdale to Oleander Rd from 0 to 4 lanes               | 2040     | RTP     | \$11,00      |
| 4120026     | Adelanto     | Widen Bellflower St from Palmdale Rd to Calleja Rd from 0 to 4 lanes         | 2040     | RTP     | \$11,00      |
| 4120028     | Adelanto     | Widen Cassia Rd from Adelanto Rd to US-395 from 2 to 4 lanes                 | 2040     | RTP     | \$53         |
| 4120030     | Adelanto     | Widen Caughlin Rd from Air Expressway to Bartlett Rd from 2 to 4 lanes       | 2040     | RTP     | \$11,00      |
| 4120033     | Adelanto     | Widen Chamberlaine Way from Jonathan St to Caughlin Rd from 0 to 4 lanes     | 2040     | RTP     | \$12,00      |
| 4120036     | Adelanto     | Widen Colbalt Rd from Holly to Rancho Rd from 2 to 4 lanes                   | 2040     | RTP     | \$1,86       |
| 4120039     | Adelanto     | Widen Colusa Rd from Mesa Linda Ave to Caughlin Rd from 0 to 4 lanes         | 2040     | RTP     | \$11,00      |
| 4A01270     | Adelanto     | Widen El Mirage Rd from Adelanto Rd to LA County Line from 2 to 4 lanes      | 2040     | RTP     | \$35,00      |
| 4120048     | Adelanto     | Widen Emerald Rd from Holly to Air Expressway from 2 to 4 lanes              | 2040     | RTP     | \$4,67       |
| 4120051     | Adelanto     | Widen Holly Rd from US-395 to Aster Rd from 0/2 to 4 lanes                   | 2040     | RTP     | \$9,00       |
| 4120058     | Adelanto     | Widen Koala Rd from El Mirage Rd to Oleander St from 0 to 4 lanes            | 2040     | RTP     | \$17,00      |
| 4A04410     | Adelanto     | Widen Koala Rd from Holly Rd to El Mirage Rd from 2 to 4 lanes               | 2040     | RTP     | \$7,18       |
| 4120061     | Adelanto     | Widen Mojave Dr from US-395 to Lessing Rd from 0/2 to 4 lanes                | 2040     | RTP     | \$15,00      |
| 4120067     | Adelanto     | Widen Palmdale Rd from Aster Rd to Richardson Rd from 0/2 to 4 lanes         | 2040     | RTP     | \$10,13      |
| 4120066     | Adelanto     | Widen Palmdale Rd from Richardson to Lessing Rd from 0/2 to 4 lanes          | 2040     | RTP     | \$9,91       |
| 4120065     | Adelanto     | Widen Palmdale Rd from US-395 to Aster Rd from 2 to 4 lanes                  | 2040     | RTP     | \$10,77      |
| 4120069     | Adelanto     | Widen Raccoon Ave from Palmdale Rd to Oleander St from 0 to 4 lanes          | 2040     | RTP     | \$16,00      |
| 4120074     | Adelanto     | Widen Rancho Rd from Amethyst Rd to Richardson Rd from 0 to 4 lanes          | 2040     | RTP     | \$18,00      |
| 4120083     | Adelanto     | Widen Seneca Rd from Aster Rd to Richardson Rd from 2 to 4 lanes             | 2040     | RTP     | \$4,37       |
| 4120082     | Adelanto     | Widen Seneca Rd from US-395 to Daisy Rd from 2 to 4 lanes                    | 2040     | RTP     | \$3,20       |
| 4120094     | Adelanto     | Widen US-395 from Chamberlaine Way to Colusa Rd from 2 to 4 lanes            | 2040     | RTP     | \$23,00      |
| 4120085     | Adelanto     | Widen Verbena Rd from Cactus Ave to Calleja Rd from 0/2 to 4 lanes           | 2040     | RTP     | \$8,00       |
| 4120088     | Adelanto     | Widen Vinton Rd from Palmdale Rd to El Mirage from 0 to 4 lanes              | 2040     | RTP     | \$14,00      |
| 4120095     | Apple Valley | Widen Apple Valley Rd from Ohna Rd to Falchion Rd from 0 to 2 lanes          | 2025     | RTP     | \$5,85       |
| 4A01008     | Apple Valley | Widen Apple Valley Rd from SR-18 to Yucca Loma Rd from 2 to 4 lanes          | 2025     | RTP     | \$26,50      |
| 4A01011     | Apple Valley | Widen Bear Valley Rd from Apple Valley Rd to Navajo Rd from 4 to 6 lanes     | 2030     | RTP     | \$6,90       |
| 4A07080     | Apple Valley | Widen Bear Valley Rd from Navajo Rd to Joshua Rd from 2 to 4 lanes           | 2030     | RTP     | \$4,50       |
| 4A07015     | Apple Valley | Widen Central Rd from Bear Valley Rd to Waalew Rd from 2 to 4 lanes          | 2025     | RTP     | \$14,40      |
|             | Apple Valley | Widen Central Rd from Roundup Way to n/ Poppy Rd from 2 to 4 lanes           | 2025     | RTP     | \$4,05       |
| 4A01013     | Apple Valley | Widen Corwin Rd from SR-18 to Dale Evans Pkwy from 2 to 4 lanes              | 2025     | RTP     | \$14,40      |
|             | Apple Valley | Widen Dale Evans Pkwy from Thunderbird Rd to I-15 from 2 to 4 lanes          | 2030     | RTP     | \$19,20      |
|             | Apple Valley | Widen Deep Creek Rd from Bear Valley Rd to Sitting Bull Rd from 0 to 4 lanes | 2030     | RTP     | \$5,20       |
|             | Apple Valley | Widen Deep Creek Rd from Tussing Rach Rd to Bear Valley Rd from 2 to 4 lanes | 2030     | RTP     | \$4,80       |
| 4A07010     | Apple Valley | Widen Del Oro Rd from Appley Valley Rd to Central Rd from 0 to 2 lanes       | 2030     | RTP     | \$16,80      |

|             |              |   | Year     | Project |              |
|-------------|--------------|---|----------|---------|--------------|
| RTP/FTIP ID | Lead Agency  | Description   | Complete | List    | Project Cost |
| 4A07161     | Apple Valley | Widen Falchion Rd from Dale Evans Pkwy to Navajo Rd from 0 to 6 lanes                       | 2030     | RTP     | \$2,40       |
|             | Apple Valley | Widen Falchion Rd from I-15 to Dale Evans Pkwy from 0 to 4 lanes                            | 2030     | RTP     | \$20,00      |
|             | Apple Valley | Widen Kiowa Rd from Ocotillo Rd to Yucca Loma Rd from 2 to 4 lanes                          | 2030     | RTP     | \$9,60       |
| 4A07032     | Apple Valley | Widen Rancherias Rd from Rincon Rd to Corwin Rd from 2 to 4 lanes                           | 2030     | RTP     | \$9,45       |
| 4A07058     | Apple Valley | Widen Roundup Way from Kiowa Rd to Central Ave from 2 to 4 lanes                            | 2025     | RTP     | \$5,40       |
| 4A07026     | Apple Valley | Widen Sitting Bull Rd from Apple Valley Rd to Navajo Rd from 2 to 4 lanes                   | 2030     | RTP     | \$10,80      |
| 4A01018     | Apple Valley | Widen Thunderbird Rd from Rancherias Rd to Central Rd from 2 to 4 lanes                     | 2025     | RTP     | \$7,20       |
| 4A07029     | Apple Valley | Widen Waalew Rd from Corwin Rd to Central Ave Rd from 2 to 4 lanes                          | 2025     | RTP     | \$10,00      |
| 4120097     | Apple Valley | Widen Yucca Loma Rd from West town Limits to SR-18 from 2 to 4 lanes                        | 2030     | RTP     | \$8,10       |
| 4A04902     | Caltrans     | Construct Passing Lanes on SR-18 from 0.8 miles w/o Orchard Dr to 2.1 miles w/o Orchard Dr  | 2030     | RTP     | \$14,09      |
| 4PL07026    | Caltrans     | Reconstruct Slopes on SR-189 and extend retaining wall on SR-18                             | 2030     | RTP     | \$7,34       |
| 4M07035     | Caltrans     | Widen SR-138 from SR-18 to Phelan Rd from 2 to 4 lanes (Phase II)                           | 2030     | RTP     | \$75,61      |
| 4A01900     | Caltrans     | Widen SR-18 from LA County Line to US-395 from 2 to 4 lanes                                 | 2030     | RTP     | \$47,77      |
| 4M0802      | Caltrans     | Widen US-395 from SR-18 (Palmdale Rd) to Chamberlaine Way from 4 to 8 lanes                 | 2019     | RTP     | \$48,55      |
| 4A01031     | Chino        | Widen Chino Ave from SR-71 to East End Ave from 4 to 6 lanes                                | 2035     | RTP     | \$98         |
| 4A07133     | Chino        | Widen East End Ave from Chino Ave to Walnut Ave from 2 to 4 lanes                           | 2030     | RTP     | \$2,90       |
| 4A07146     | Chino        | Widen East End Ave from Philadelphia Ave to Phillips Blvd from 2 to 4 lanes                 | 2030     | RTP     | \$2,70       |
| 4A01032     | Chino        | Widen Edison Ave from Central Ave to Euclid Ave from 4 to 6 lanes                           | 2025     | RTP     | \$3,98       |
| 4A01063     | Chino        | Widen El Prado Rd from Central Ave to Pine Ave from 2 to 4 lanes                            | 2025     | RTP     | \$1,47       |
| 4120106     | Chino        | Widen Eucild Ave (SR-83) from Merril Ave to Kimball Ave from 2 to 4 lanes                   | 2030     | RTP     | \$1,22       |
| 4A04036     | Chino        | Widen Euclid Ave from Pine Ave to SR-71 from 2/4 to 8 lanes                                 | 2035     | RTP     | \$11,50      |
| 4A04038     | Chino        | Widen Hellman Ave from Kimball Ave to Chino Corona Rd from 2 to 4 lanes                     | 2025     | RTP     | \$4,30       |
| 4A07052     | Chino        | Widen Kimball Ave from Euclid Ave to Hellman Ave from 2 to 4 lanes                          | 2025     | RTP     | \$5,90       |
| 4A01041     | Chino        | Widen Mountain Ave from Philadelphia St to Riverside Dr from 4 to 6 lanes                   | 2025     | RTP     | \$1,79       |
| 4120107     | Chino        | Widen Mountain Ave from Schaefer Ave to Edison Ave from 2 to 4 lanes                        | 2025     | RTP     | \$20         |
| 4A01042     | Chino        | Widen Philadelphia St from Central Ave to Benson Ave from 4 to 6 lanes                      | 2025     | RTP     | \$89         |
| 4A01043     | Chino        | Widen Philadelphia St from LA County Line to Central Ave from 2 to 4 lanes                  | 2025     | RTP     | \$2,93       |
| 4A07279     | Chino        | Widen Pipeline Ave from Riverside Dr to Walnut Ave from 2 to 4 lanes                        | 2025     | RTP     | \$1,02       |
| 4A07151     | Chino        | Widen Ramona Ave from Philadelphia Ave to Phillips Blvd from 2 to 4 lanes                   | 2025     | RTP     | \$2,63       |
| 4A01047     |              | Widen Riverside Dr from Fern Ave to Euclid Ave from 2 to 6 lanes(Eastbound only)            | 2025     | RTP     | \$77         |
| 4A01049     | Chino        | Widen Riverside Dr from Pipeline Ave to Fern Ave from 4 to 6 lanes                          | 2025     | RTP     | \$4,7        |
| 4120108     | Chino        | Widen Riverside Dr from West Chino City Limits to Reservior Ave from 4 to 6 lanes (WB Only) | 2025     | RTP     | \$60         |
| 4A01384     |              | Widen SR-83 from Merrill Ave to Kimball Ave from 4 to 8 lanes                               | 2029     | RTP     | \$1,53       |
| 4160068     |              | Construct Grade Separation for Valley Blvd @ SFRR   | 2030     | RTP     | \$40,00      |
| 4120116     |              | Realign Reche Canyon Rd from Washington St to Colton City Limits to 4 lane road             | 2025     | RTP     | \$2,1        |
| 4A07226     |              | Widen Agua Mansa Rd from Rancho Ave to 73 meters e/o Rancho Ave from 2 to 4 lanes           | 2030     | RTP     | \$74         |
| 4120110     |              | Widen Agua Mansa Rd from Rancho Ave to Riverside Ave from 2 to 4 lanes                      | 2025     | RTP     | \$3,32       |
| 4120112     |              | Widen and extend Pepper Ave from I-10 to Slover Ave from 2 to 4 lanes                       | 2030     | RTP     | \$5,9        |
| 4A01066     |              | Widen Barton Rd from South Colton City Limits to Washington St from 4 to 6 lanes            | 2025     | RTP     | \$1,04       |
| 4120113     |              | Widen C St from City Limits w/o Rancho Ave to Pennsylvania Ave from 2 to 4 lanes            | 2025     | RTP     | \$1,2        |
| 4A07192     |              | Widen C St from Jackson to Tejon Ave from 2 to 4 lanes                                      | 2023     | RTP     | \$1,75       |

|             |               |   | Year     | Project |              |
|-------------|---------------|---|----------|---------|--------------|
| RTP/FTIP ID | Lead Agency   | Description   | Complete | List    | Project Cost |
| 4120111     |               | Widen Colton Ave from Mt. Vernon Ave to City Limit from 2 to 4 lanes                      | 2025     | RTP     | 1 - 7        |
| 4A04067     | Colton        | Widen Fairway Dr from Sperry Dr to Colton City Limits from 4 to 8 lanes                   | 2025     | RTP     | \$1,405      |
| 4120114     | Colton        | Widen La Cadena Dr from Palm Ave to Iowa Ave from 4 to 6 lanes                            | 2030     | RTP     | \$2,873      |
| 4120115     | Colton        | Widen La Cadena Dr from Rancho Ave to Litton Ave from 4 to 6 lanes                        | 2030     |         | \$3,475      |
| 4160046     |               | Widen Mt Vernon across UPRR and Santa Ana River from 2 to 4 lanes                         | 2025     | RTP     | \$30,000     |
| 4A07313     |               | Widen Reche Canyon Rd from South Crystal Ridge to Riverside County Line from 2 to 4 lanes | 2025     | RTP     | \$2,570      |
| 4120117     | Colton        | Widen Riverside Ave from Riverside County Line to Santa Ana River from 4 to 6 lanes       | 2030     | RTP     | \$8,791      |
| 4120118     |               | Widen Riverside Ave from Santa Ana River to Agua Mansa Rd from 4 to 6 lanes               | 2030     |         | \$1,811      |
| 4120119     | Colton        | Widen San Bernardino Ave from County Limit to Rancho Ave from 2 to 4 lanes                | 2025     | RTP     | \$155        |
| 4120120     | Colton        | Widen San Bernardino Ave from West Colton City Limits to County Limit from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2025     | RTP     | \$1,867      |
| 4120121     | Colton        | Widen Slover Ave from Pepper Ave to Riverside Ave from 2 to 4 lanes                       | 2025     | RTP     | \$3,024      |
| 4A01082     | Colton        | Widen Valley Blvd from Sycamore Ave to Mt Vernon Ave from 4 to 6 lanes                    | 2025     | RTP     | \$4,015      |
| 4120122     | Colton        | Widen Washington St from Waterman Ave to I-215 from 4 to 6 lanes                          | 2025     | RTP     | \$5,640      |
| 4120123     | Colton        | Widen Washington St to from Aqueduct to La Cadena Dr from 0 to 2 lanes                    | 2025     | RTP     | \$4,136      |
| 4A07145     | Fontana       | Widen Banana Ave from Jurupa Ave to Slover Ave from 2 to 4 lanes                          | 2025     | RTP     | \$1,583      |
| 4A07083     | Fontana       | Widen Baseline Ave from Mango Ave to Maple Ave Widen from 2 to 6 lanes                    | 2025     | RTP     | \$4,200      |
| 4160028     | Fontana       | Widen Cherry from s/o I-15 to South Highland Ave from 2 to 6 lanes                        | 2025     | RTP     | \$4,000      |
| 4A01096     | Fontana       | Widen Citrus Ave from Slover Ave to Jurupa Ave from 2 to 4 lanes                          | 2025     | RTP     | \$4,200      |
| 4A04098     | Fontana       | Widen Cypress Ave from South Highland Ave to Sierra Lakes Pkwy from 0 to 4 lanes          | 2025     | RTP     | \$10,000     |
| 4120131     | Fontana       | Widen Fontana Ave from Valley Blvd to Lime Ave from 2 to 4 lanes                          | 2025     | RTP     | \$1,136      |
| 4120236     | Fontana       | Widen Fontana Ave from Valley Blvd to Merrill Ave from 2 to 4 lanes                       | 2025     | RTP     | \$5,251      |
| 4A07187     | Fontana       | Widen Live Oak Ave from Arrow Route to Foothill Blvd from 2 to 4 lanes                    | 2025     | RTP     | \$1,688      |
| 4120133     | Fontana       | Widen Live Oak Ave from Jurupa Ave to Slover Ave from 2 to 4 lanes                        | 2025     | RTP     | \$2,625      |
| 4A04110     | Fontana       | Widen Live Oak Rd from Valley Blvd to Merrill Ave from 2 to 4 lanes                       | 2025     | RTP     | \$5,285      |
| 4A07045     | Fontana       | Widen Lytle Creek Rd from Summit Ave to Duncan Ave from 0 to 4 lanes                      | 2025     | RTP     | \$7,500      |
| 4120134     | Fontana       | Widen Poplar Ave from Slover Ave to Valley Blvd from 0 to 4 lanes (I-10 Overcrossing)     | 2030     | RTP     | \$16,925     |
| 4A07084     | Fontana       | Widen San Sevaine Rd from Baseline Ave to Summit Ave from 2 to 4 lanes                    | 2025     | RTP     | \$4,200      |
| 4A07158     | Fontana       | Widen Santa Ana Ave from Mullberry Ave to Redwood Ave from 2 to 4 lanes                   | 2030     | RTP     | \$2,531      |
| 4A04122     | Fontana       | Widen Sierra Ave from San Bernardino Ave to Foothill Blvd from 4 to 6 lanes               | 2025     | RTP     | \$19,600     |
| 4A07034     | Fontana       | Widen Sierra Lakes Pkwy from Cherry Ave to Catawba Ave Widen from 2 to 4 lanes            | 2025     | RTP     | \$8,960      |
| 4A01285     | Fontana       | Widen Slover Ave from Alder Ave to Cactus Ave from 2 to 4 lanes                           | 2025     | RTP     | \$4,420      |
| 4A07259     | Fontana       | Widen Slover Ave from Tamarind Ave to East Fontana City Limits Widen from 4 to 6 lanes    | 2025     | RTP     | \$840        |
| 4A07166     | Fontana       | Widen South Highland Ave from Sierra Ave to Palmetto Ave Widen from 2 to 4 lanes          | 2025     | RTP     | \$2,100      |
| 4A07167     | Fontana       | Widen Summit Ave from Cherry Ave to San Sevaine Rd from 2 to 4 lanes                      | 2025     | RTP     |              |
| 4A07077     | Fontana       | Widen Walnut Ave from I-15 to San Sevaine Rd from 2 to 4 lanes                            | 2025     | RTP     |              |
| 4G04027     | Grand Terrace | Construct Grade Separation at Main St in Grand Terrace on the San Bernardino Line         | 2030     | RTP     | \$18,100     |
|             | Grand Terrace | Widen Michigan St from Commerce Way and Van Buren St from 2 to 4 lanes                    | 2025     | RTP     | \$742        |
|             | Hesperia      | Construct Grade Separation connection to Main St  | 2035     | RTP     | \$4,500      |
|             | Hesperia      | Construct Grade Separation for Eucalyptus St @ SFRR                                       | 2035     | RTP     |              |

|               |             |  | Year     | Project |              |
|---------------|-------------|--|----------|---------|--------------|
| RTP/FTIP ID   | Lead Agency | Description  | Complete | List    | Project Cost |
| 201104        | Hesperia    | Lemon St/Mauna Loa St - new RR Grade Separation that includes construction of a new 6 lane overcrossing and realignment and reconstruction of Lemon St and Mauna Loa St from 3rd Ave to just West of E Ave | 2021     | FTIP    | \$47,90      |
| 4A01152       | Hesperia    | Widen Hesperia Rd from Bear Valley Rd to Sultana St from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2030     | RTP     | \$9,20       |
| 4160037       | Hesperia    | Widen I Ave from Main St to Bear Valley Rd from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2025     | RTP     | \$7,70       |
| 200211        | Hesperia    | Widen I Ave from Main St to Bear Valley Rd from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2035     | RTP     | \$7,70       |
| SBD031284     | Hesperia    | Widen I Ave from Ranchero Rd to Main St from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2035     | RTP     | \$7,61       |
| 4A01155       | Hesperia    | Widen Lemon St from 3rd Ave to I Ave from 2 to 4 lanes and construct Grade Separation at BNSF RR w/ Regional Storm Drain   | 2040     | RTP     | \$20,00      |
| 4A01157       | Hesperia    | Widen Main St from US-395 to I-15 from 4 to 6 lanes  | 2040     | RTP     | \$17,95      |
| 4A01159       | Hesperia    | Widen Maple Ave from Eucalyptus Ave to Main St from 2 to 5 lanes   | 2038     | RTP     | \$5,28       |
| 4A01162       | Hesperia    | Widen Mauna Loa Rd from 7th Ave to 3rd Ave from 2 to 4 lanes and connect to Lemon St   | 2035     | RTP     | \$2,50       |
| SBD55028      | Hesperia    | Widen Ranchero Rd from Danbury to Arrowhead Lake Rd from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2035     | RTP     | \$11,00      |
| 4A01168       | Hesperia    | Widen Rock Springs Rd from Glendale Ave to East Hesperia City Limits from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2027     | RTP     | \$1,50       |
| 4A07231       | Highland    | Construct new 2-lane road on Lankershim Ave from 660' n/o Base Line Rd to 1200' n/o 9th St   | 2032     | RTP     | \$1,23       |
| 4A07150       | Highland    | Construct new street for Cone Camp Rd from Greenspot Rd to South Highland City Limit from 0 to 2 lanes   | 2035     | RTP     | \$2,77       |
| 4A07019       | Highland    | Construct new street, branch off from Greenspot Rd to connect to SR-38 from 0 to 2/4 lanes within City Limit including bridge over Mill Creek  | 2025     | RTP     | \$52,00      |
| 4M0801        | Highland    | SR-210 @ Victoria Ave - Construct new interchange  | 2040     | RTP     | \$93,00      |
| 4A07136       | Highland    | Widen Highland Ave from Church St to Boulder Ave from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2025     | RTP     | \$3,13       |
| 4A07275       | Highland    | Widen Pacific St from 2 lots w/o Cole Ave to Palm Ave from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2030     | RTP     | \$96         |
| 4160024       | Loma Linda  | Construct Grade Separation for Beaumont Ave @ UPRR   | 2030     | RTP     | \$25,00      |
| 4A07196       | Loma Linda  | Construct new 2 lane road on Van Leuven Ave from Evans St to Orange Grove St   | 2030     | RTP     | \$1,60       |
| 4A07002       | Loma Linda  | Construct new 4-lane road on Evans St from UPRR to Barton Rd   | 2030     | RTP     | \$32,15      |
| 4120144       | Loma Linda  | Widen Evans St from I-10 to Barton Rd from 0 to 4 lanes  | 2040     | RTP     | \$77,64      |
| 4A01267       | Montclair   | Widen Central Ave from Montclair City Limit to Chino City Limit from 4 to 6 lanes  | 2035     | RTP     | \$1,40       |
| 4G07421       | Montclair   | Widen Central Ave grade separation on the Alhambra and Los Angeles Lines from 4 to 6 lanes   | 2035     | RTP     | \$5,93       |
| 4A01183       | Montclair   | Widen Monte Vista Ave from San Bernardino St to Arrow Hwy from 4 to 6 lanes  | 2025     | RTP     | \$3,87       |
| 4A01184       | Montclair   | Widen San Bernardino St from LA County Line to Benson Ave from 4 to 6 lanes  | 2025     | RTP     | \$4,77       |
| 4160062       | Omnitrans   | Downtown Transit Center enhancements - Additional 7,000 sf building  | 2021     | RTP     | \$7,50       |
| 4160047       | Omnitrans   | Implement regionally compatible smart fare media system  | 2019     | RTP     | \$3,00       |
| 4160059       | Omnitrans   | Implement rooftop solar at Omnitrans operations and maintenance facilities in Montclair and San Bernardino and at the Downtown San Bernardino Transit Center at E St and Rialto                            | 2019     | RTP     | \$5,00       |
| 4160043       | Omnitrans   | Vehicle storage and maintenance facility for Access/BRT vehicles   | 2020     | RTP     | \$5,00       |
| 4120213       | OmniTrans   | West Valley Connector BRT from Pomona Metrolink Station to Sierra Ave  | 2025     | RTP     | \$242,00     |
| 4A07208       | Ontario     | Construct bridge on Francis St over Cucamonga Creek-sidewalk only  | 2025     | RTP     | \$90         |
| 4160061       | Ontario     | Construct Grade Separation on San Antonio Ave at UPRR (Alhambra and Los Angeles Line)  | 2035     | RTP     | \$24,00      |
| G0103/ 4G0109 |             | Contruct 4-lane grade separation on San Antonio Ave at Alhambra/Los Angeles Line   | 2035     | RTP     |              |
| 4160010       | Ontario     | SR-60 @ Vineyard Ave interchange reconstruction  | 2040     | RTP     | \$51,00      |

|                |             |  | Year     | Project |              |
|----------------|-------------|--|----------|---------|--------------|
| RTP/FTIP ID    | Lead Agency | Description  | Complete | List    | Project Cost |
| 4A07326        | Ontario     | Widen 1-lane bridge on Archibald Ave over Lower Deer Creek to 6 lanes                                    | 2025     | RTP     | \$179        |
| 4A07174        |             | Widen 2-lane bridge on Eight St over Cucamonga Creek to 4 lanes  | 2035     | RTP     | \$927        |
| 4A07278        | Ontario     | Widen 4-lane bridge on Archibald Ave over Upper Deer Creek Spillway to 6 lanes                           | 2025     | RTP     | \$848        |
| 4A07277        | Ontario     | Widen 4-lane bridge on Archibald Ave over Upper Deer Creek to 6 lanes                                    | 2025     | RTP     | \$606        |
| 4A07327        | Ontario     | Widen 4-lane bridge on Holt Blvd over Cucamonga Creek to 6 lanes   | 2025     | RTP     | \$1,346      |
| 4160019        | Ontario     | Widen 8th St from West Cucamonga Channel to Grove Ave from 2 to 4 lanes                                  | 2035     | RTP     | \$156        |
| 4160020        |             | Widen Acacia St from Baker Ave to Vineyard Ave from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2035     | RTP     | \$70         |
| 4120145        | Ontario     | Widen Airport Dr from Rochester Ave to Etiwanda Ave from 2 to 4 lanes                                    | 2025     | RTP     | \$5,270      |
| 4A04189        | Ontario     | Widen Archibald Ave from Edison Ave to South Ontario City Limits from 2 to 6 lanes                       | 2025     | RTP     | \$7,189      |
| 4160023        | Ontario     | Widen Archibald Ave from Inland Empire Blvd to 4th St from 4 to 6 lanes                                  | 2035     | RTP     | \$1,921      |
| 4A04190        | Ontario     | Widen Archibald Ave from Riverside Ave to Edison Ave from 2 to 6 lanes                                   | 2025     | RTP     | \$6,686      |
| 4160025        | Ontario     | Widen Bon View Ave from Mission Blvd to Belmont Ave from 2 to 4 lanes                                    | 2035     | RTP     | \$636        |
| 4A07325        | Ontario     | Widen bridge on Holt Blvd over West Cucamonga Creek from 4 to 6 lanes                                    | 2025     | RTP     | \$120        |
| 4A07317        | Ontario     | Widen bridge on Mission Blvd over Cucamonga Creek from 4 to 6 lanes                                      | 2025     | RTP     | \$988        |
| 4A07215        | Ontario     | Widen bridge on Mission Blvd over West Cucamonga Creek from 4 to 6 lanes                                 | 2025     | RTP     | \$337        |
| 4A07267        | Ontario     | Widen bridge on Riverside Dr over Cucamonga Creek from 4 to 6 lanes                                      | 2035     | RTP     | \$526        |
| 4A04193        | Ontario     | Widen Campus Ave from Riverside Dr to Merrill Ave from 2 to 4 lanes                                      | 2025     | RTP     | \$5,016      |
| 4160026        | Ontario     | Widen Campus Ave from Woodlawn St to Mission Blvd from 2 to 4 lanes                                      | 2035     | RTP     | \$1,130      |
| 4A04197        | Ontario     | Widen Edison Ave from Euclid Ave to Walker Ave from 2 to 8 lanes   | 2025     | RTP     | \$8,268      |
| 4A04196        | Ontario     | Widen Edison Ave from Mill Creek Ave to Milliken Ave from 2 to 8 lanes                                   | 2025     | RTP     | \$3,177      |
| 4A04198        | Ontario     | Widen Edison Ave from Vineyard Ave to Mill Creek Ave from 2 to 8 lanes                                   | 2025     | RTP     | \$20,727     |
| 4A04199        | Ontario     | Widen Edison Ave from Walker to Vineyard Ave from 2 to 8 lanes   | 2025     | RTP     | \$3,042      |
| 4A04200        | Ontario     | Widen Eucalyptus Ave from Euclid Ave to Milliken Ave (Hamner Ave) from 2 to 4 lanes                      | 2035     | RTP     | \$2,675      |
| 4A04201        | Ontario     | Widen Euclid Ave from Riverside Dr to Merrill Ave from 2 to 4 lanes (NB only)                            | 2035     | RTP     | \$10,999     |
| SBD59004       | Ontario     | Widen Francis St from Bon View Ave to Grove from 2 to 4 lanes (storm drain from Bon View to Parco)       | 2035     | RTP     | \$9,600      |
| 4G0104/ 4G0112 | Ontario     | Widen grade separation @ UPRR Alhambra/Los Angeles Lines from 2 to 4 lanes                               | 2032     | RTP     | \$24,000     |
| 4A04206        | Ontario     | Widen Grove Ave from Riverside Dr to Merrill Ave from 2 to 4 lanes                                       | 2035     | RTP     | \$8,192      |
| 4160035        | Ontario     | Widen Guasti Rd from Holt Blvd to Archibald Ave from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2035     | RTP     | \$932        |
| 4A04208        | Ontario     | Widen Haven Ave from Riverside Dr to Bellegrave Ave from 2 to 4 lanes                                    | 2035     | RTP     | \$3,512      |
| 4A04214        | Ontario     | Widen Mill Creek Ave from Riverside Dr to Bellgrave Ave 2-4 lanes  | 2025     | RTP     | \$3,512      |
| 4A04215        | Ontario     | Widen Milliken Ave (Hamner Ave) from Edison Ave to South Ontario City Limits from 2 to 3 lanes (SB Only) | 2025     | RTP     | \$1,672      |
| 4A04216        | Ontario     | Widen Milliken Ave (Hamner Ave) from Riverside Ave to Edison Ave from 1 to 4 lanes (SB Only)             | 2025     | RTP     | \$4,012      |
| 4160044        | Ontario     | Widen Milliken/Hamner Ave from SR-60 to Riverside Dr from 4 to 6 lanes                                   | 2035     | RTP     | \$381        |
| 4A04218        | Ontario     | Widen Ontario/Hellman Ave from Riverside Dr to Bellgrave from 0 to 2/4 lanes                             | 2030     | RTP     | \$4,346      |
| 4A07266        |             | Widen Philadelphia St from Campus Ave to 750' e/o Grove Ave from 2 to 4 lanes                            | 2030     | RTP     | \$817        |
| 4160050        |             | Widen Phillips St from Benson Ave to Mountain Ave from 2 to 4 lanes                                      | 2035     | RTP     | \$802        |
| 4A04219        |             | Widen Riverside Dr from Euclid Ave to Milliken Ave from 2 to 4 lanes                                     | 2030     | RTP     | \$4,793      |
| 4160060        |             | Widen San Antonio Ave from Park St to Phillips St from 2 to 4 lanes                                      | 2035     | RTP     | \$1,746      |
| 4A04220        |             | Widen Schaefer Ave from Euclid Ave to Haven Ave from 0 to 4 lanes  | 2030     | RTP     | \$3,760      |

|             |                  |  | Year     | Project |              |
|-------------|------------------|--|----------|---------|--------------|
| RTP/FTIP ID | Lead Agency      | Description  | Complete | List    | Project Cost |
| 4160063     | Ontario          | Widen State St from Bon View Ave to Grove Ave from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2035     | RTP     | \$870        |
| 4160066     | Ontario          | Widen Turner Ave from Inland Empire Blvd to 4th St from 2 to 4 lanes in southbound direction only                    | 2035     | RTP     | \$714        |
| 4A01222     | Ontario          | Widen Vineyard Ave from 4th St to I-10 from 4 to 6 lanes   | 2025     | RTP     | \$1,20       |
| 4A04223     | Ontario          | Widen Vineyard Ave from Riverside Dr to Merill Ave from 0 to 6 lanes   | 2025     | RTP     | \$5,85       |
| 4160070     |                  | Widen Walker Ave from Riverside Dr to Merrill Ave from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2035     | RTP     | \$4,34       |
| 201134      | Rancho Cucamonga | Construct Grade Separation for Etiwanda Ave @ SCRRA tracks   | 2025     | RTP     | \$54,05      |
| 4120172     | Rancho Cucamonga | Construct new 4-lane bridge at Wilson and Day Creek Channel  | 2025     | RTP     | \$1,76       |
| 201138      | Rancho Cucamonga | Construct new 4-lane divided Youngs Canyon Rd from San Sevaine to Cherry Ave   | 2026     | RTP     | \$1,70       |
| 200152      | Rancho Cucamonga | I-15 @ Arrow Route - Construct new interchange between Arrow Route and Foothill Blvd                                 | 2040     | RTP     | \$91,37      |
| 4120153     | Rancho Cucamonga | Widen 6th St at Cucamonga Creek Channel from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2025     | RTP     | \$44         |
| 4120157     | Rancho Cucamonga | Widen Arrow Rte at Etiwanda Ditch from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2025     | RTP     | \$88         |
| 20020134    | Rancho Cucamonga | Widen Arrow Rte from Etiwanda Ave to east city limit from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2035     | RTP     | \$1,10       |
| 4120163     | Rancho Cucamonga | Widen Arrow Rte from Grove St to Baker St from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2025     | RTP     | \$1,55       |
| 4120155     | Rancho Cucamonga | Widen Baseline Rd from Etiwanda Ave to I-15 from 4 to 6 lanes  | 2025     | RTP     | \$58         |
| 200023      | Rancho Cucamonga | Widen Cherry Ave from south city limits to Wilson Ave from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2035     | RTP     | \$83         |
| 4120165     | Rancho Cucamonga | Widen Church Ave from Archibald Ave to Haven Ave from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2025     | RTP     | \$1,80       |
| 4120156     | Rancho Cucamonga | Widen East Ave from Chateau Dr to Victoria Ave from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2025     | RTP     | \$62         |
| 4120148     | Rancho Cucamonga | Widen East St from Wilson Ave to North Rim Way (new) from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2025     | RTP     | \$24         |
| 4120152     | Rancho Cucamonga | Widen Etiwanda Ave from Miller Ave to 850' n/o Miller Ave, NB only from 3 to 4 lanes                                 | 2025     | RTP     | \$36         |
| 4120169     | Rancho Cucamonga | Widen Etiwanda Ave from 6th St to Arrow Route from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2025     | RTP     | \$5,06       |
| 4120164     | Rancho Cucamonga | Widen Etiwanda Ave from Banyan Rd to Wilson Ave from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2025     | RTP     | \$1,67       |
| 4120149     | Rancho Cucamonga | Widen Etiwanda Ave from existing terminus to North Rim Way (new) from 0 to 2 lanes                                   | 2025     | RTP     | \$33         |
| 4120166     | Rancho Cucamonga | Widen Foothill Blvd from Archibald Ave to Hermosa Ave from 4 to 6 lanes  | 2025     | RTP     | \$2,23       |
|             | Rancho Cucamonga | Widen Foothill Blvd from Vineyard Ave to Archibald Ave from 4 to 6 lanes   | 2025     | RTP     | \$3,53       |
| 4160034     | Rancho Cucamonga | Widen Grove from San Bernardino Ave to Foothill Blvd from 1 to 2 lanes (east side only)                              | 2025     | RTP     | \$71         |
| 4120158     | Rancho Cucamonga | Widen Hellman Ave at Cucamonga Creek Channel from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2025     | RTP     | \$88         |
| 4120167     | Rancho Cucamonga | Widen Miller Rd from Etiwanda Ave to East St from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2025     | RTP     | \$1,95       |
| 4M07034     | Rancho Cucamonga | Widen northbound on-ramp to 2 lanes to the metering point, transition to 1 lane at the gore & install ramp metering  | 2025     | RTP     | \$1,05       |
| 4120151     | Rancho Cucamonga | Widen Victoria Ave from Etiwanda High School to I-15 from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2025     | RTP     | \$34         |
|             | Rancho Cucamonga | Widen Wilson Ave from Milliken Ave to Day Creek Blvd from 0 to 4 lanes   | 2025     | RTP     | \$7,06       |
| 4A01262B    |                  | Widen 5th Ave from Crafton Ave to Wabash Ave from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2025     | RTP     | \$3,38       |
|             | Redlands         | Widen Alabama St from 3rd St to San Bernardino Ave from 2 to 4 lanes at Santa Ana River                              | 2025     | RTP     | \$7,15       |
|             | Redlands         | Widen Alabama St from Lugonia Ave to Barton Rd from 4 to 6 lanes   | 2025     | RTP     | \$17,40      |
|             | Redlands         | Widen Alabama St from North Redlands City Limits to Palmetto Ave from 2 to 4 lanes                                   | 2025     | RTP     | \$7,70       |
|             | Redlands         | Widen California St from Redlands Blvd to Palmetto Ave from 5 to 6 lanes (add NB lane for 3 lanes in each direction) | 2025     | RTP     | \$45,00      |
| 4401239     | Redlands         | Widen Church St from Colton Ave to Redlands Blvd from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2025     | RTP     | \$4,15       |
| SBD58044    |                  | Widen Citrus Ave Auburn Ct to Wabash Ave from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2025     | RTP     | \$52         |
|             | Redlands         | Widen Citrus Ave from Dearborn St to Wabash Ave from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2035     | RTP     | \$1,14       |
|             | Redlands         | Widen Colton Ave from Wabash Ave to Crafton Ave from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2025     | RTP     | \$1,14       |

|             |             |  | Year     | Project |              |
|-------------|-------------|--|----------|---------|--------------|
| RTP/FTIP ID | Lead Agency | Description  | Complete | List    | Project Cost |
|             | Redlands    | Widen Crafton Hills Pkwy from Wabash Ave to East Redlands City Limits from 0 to 2 lanes                      | 2025     | RTP     | \$6,87       |
| -           | Redlands    | Widen Cypress Ave from I-10 to Citrus Av from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2025     | RTP     | \$75         |
|             | Redlands    | Widen Ford St from 5th Ave to I-10 from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2025     | RTP     | \$1,99       |
|             | Redlands    | Widen Greenspot Rd from 0.19 m n/o Florida St to Florida St from 2 to 4 lanes                                | 2035     | RTP     | \$43         |
|             | Redlands    | Widen Highland Ave from Cajon St to Ford St from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2035     | RTP     | \$4,00       |
|             | Redlands    | Widen Live Oak Cyn Rd from San Timoteo Cyn Rd to East Redlands City Limits from 2 to 4 lanes                 | 2025     | RTP     | \$5,82       |
| 4A07255     | Redlands    | Widen Lugonia Ave from California St to Tennesee St from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2035     | RTP     | \$3,30       |
| 4A01246     | Redlands    | Widen Lugonia Ave from Tenessee St to Orange St from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2025     | RTP     | \$3,35       |
| 4120175     | Redlands    | Widen Mountain View Ave from Lugonia Ave to San Bernardino Ave from 1 to 2 lanes (NB only)                   | 2025     | RTP     | \$50         |
| 4A07112     | Redlands    | Widen Nevada St from Lugonia Ave to Palmetto Ave from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2025     | RTP     | \$3,37       |
| 200420      | Redlands    | Widen Orange St from north city limits to Riverview Dr from 2 to 4 lanes                                     | 2035     | RTP     | \$54         |
| 4A07154     | Redlands    | Widen Palmetto Ave from California St to Alabama St from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2025     | RTP     | \$2,56       |
| 4401240     | Redlands    | Widen Redlands Blvd from West Redlands City Limits to Colton Ave from 4 to 6 lanes and widen intersection at | 2025     | RTP     | \$12,35      |
| 4A01249     | Reulatius   | Colton Ave   | 2025     | NIP     | Ş12,55       |
| 4A01281     | Redlands    | Widen San Bernardino Ave from Alabama St to California St from 2 to 4 lanes                                  | 2025     | RTP     | \$5,05       |
| 4A01250     | Redlands    | Widen San Bernardino Ave from Church St to Wabash Ave from 2 to 4 lanes                                      | 2025     | RTP     | \$2,66       |
| 4120179     | Redlands    | Widen San Bernardino Ave from SR-210 to Orange St from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2025     | RTP     | \$1,91       |
| 4A01254     | Redlands    | Widen San Timoteo Cyn Rd from RR Crossing to Live Oak Cyn Rd from 2 to 4 lanes                               | 2035     | RTP     | \$6,89       |
| 4A07253     | Redlands    | Widen Wabash Ave from Colton Ave to San Bernardino Ave from 2 to 4 lanes                                     | 2025     | RTP     | \$2,06       |
| 4A07381     | Redlands    | Widen Wabash Ave from Redlands City Limits to I-10 from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2025     | RTP     | \$10         |
| 4160058     | Rialto      | Construct Grade Separation for Riverside Ave @ UPRR and widen bridge from 5 to 7 lanes                       | 2030     | RTP     | \$37,57      |
| 4120181     | Rialto      | Widen Alder Ave from Baseline Rd to Renaissance Pkwy from 2 to 4 lanes                                       | 2025     | RTP     | \$1,80       |
| 4120183     | Rialto      | Widen Casmalia Ave from 0.3 miles e/o Sierra Ave to Ayala Dr from 2 to 4 lanes                               | 2025     | RTP     | \$4,60       |
| 4160027     | Rialto      | Widen Cedar Ave from Randall Ave to Baseline Rd from 4 to 6 lanes  | 2025     | RTP     | \$5,02       |
| 4120184     | Rialto      | Widen Linden Ave from Baseline Ave to Miro Way from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2025     | RTP     | \$50         |
| 4160039     | Rialto      | Widen Linden Ave from Miro Way to Renaissance Pkwy from 0 to 4 lanes   | 2025     | RTP     | \$2,88       |
| 4120185     | Rialto      | Widen Locust Ave from Baseline Ave to Miro Way from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2025     | RTP     | \$50         |
| 4160040     | Rialto      | Widen Locust Ave from Miro Way to Renaissance Pkwy from 0 to 4 lanes   | 2025     | RTP     | \$2,64       |
| 4160041     | Rialto      | Widen Merrill Ave from 0.11 m e/o Cactus Ave to Lilac Ave from 3 to 4 lanes (Add 1 WB lane)                  | 2030     | RTP     | \$14         |
| 4A07120     | Rialto      | Widen Merrill Ave from Linden Ave to 0.12 miles e/o Linden Ave from 3 to 4 lanes                             | 2030     | RTP     | \$12         |
| 4120231     | Rialto      | Widen Randall Ave from Linden Ave to Riverside Ave from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2025     | RTP     | \$3,40       |
| 4120180     | Rialto      | Widen Renaissance Pkwy from Alder Ave to Ayala Dr from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2025     | RTP     | \$1,5        |
| 4A07199     |             | Widen Rialto Ave from Olive Ave to Sycamore Ave from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2025     | RTP     | \$34         |
| 4160054     |             | Widen Rialto Ave from Sycamore Ave to Eucalyptus Ave from 2 to 4 lanes                                       | 2025     | RTP     | \$1,00       |
| 4A01259     | Rialto      | Widen Riverside Ave from 0.25 miles s/o Valley Blvd to Slover Ave from 2 to 3 lanes (SB only)                | 2025     | RTP     | \$20         |
| 4160056     | Rialto      | Widen Riverside Ave from 0.35 m s/o Sierra Ave to Alder Ave from 4 to 6 lanes                                | 2030     | RTP     | \$2,12       |
| 4A01258     |             | Widen Riverside Ave from Agua Mansa Rd to Slover Ave from 4 to 6 lanes                                       | 2030     | RTP     | \$3,46       |
| 4160055     |             | Widen Riverside Ave from Foothill Blvd to Easton St from 4 to 6 lanes  | 2025     | RTP     | \$3,76       |
| 4120187     |             | Widen Riverside Ave from Gateway Plaza to San Bernardino Ave from 4 to 6 lanes                               | 2025     | RTP     | \$60         |
| 4A07237     |             | Widen Riverside Ave from Locust Ave to 0.1 miles s/o Cedar Ave from 3 to 6 lanes                             | 2023     | RTP     | \$3,1        |
| 4160057     |             | Widen Riverside Ave from San Bernardino Ave to Rialto Ave from 4 to 6 lanes                                  | 2030     | RTP     | \$2,90       |

|             |                        |   | Year     | Project |              |
|-------------|------------------------|---|----------|---------|--------------|
| RTP/FTIP ID | Lead Agency            | Description   | Complete | List    | Project Cost |
| 4120188     | Rialto                 | Widen Riverside Ave from Sierra Ave to 0.35 miles s/o Sierra Ave from 2 to 6 lanes                                    | 2030     | RTP     | \$1,40       |
| 4A07101     |                        | Widen San Bernardino Ave from Lilac Ave to Sycamore Ave from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2030     | RTP     | \$1,520      |
| 4A07003     | San Bernardino, City   | Replace I-10 Bridge to Widen Waterman Ave from Hospitality Ln to Redlands Blvd from 4 to 6 Lanes                      | 2030     | RTP     | \$30,000     |
| 4A07230     | San Bernardino, City   | Widen 5th St from Pedley Rd to Tippecanoe Ave from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2025     | RTP     | \$1,18       |
| 4A07292     | San Bernardino, City   | Widen 5th St from Warm Creek to Pedley Ave from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2030     | RTP     | \$1,148      |
| 4A07081     | San Bernardino, City   | Widen Coulston Ave from Tippecanoe Ave to Mountain View Ave from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2030     | RTP     | \$4,224      |
| 4A07380     | San Bernardino, City   | Widen Del Rosa Ave from Del Rosa Dr to San Bernardino City Limits from 2 to 4 lanes                                   | 2025     | RTP     | \$90         |
|             | San Bernardino, City   | Widen Electric Ave from Mt View Ave to Northpark Blvd from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2030     | RTP     | \$3,84       |
| 4A07176     | San Bernardino, City   | Widen G St from Mill St to Rialto Ave from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2030     | RTP     | \$2,29       |
| 4A07177     | San Bernardino, City   | Widen Little League Dr from Kendall Dr to Belmont Ave from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2030     | RTP     | \$5,00       |
| 4A07243     | San Bernardino, City   | Widen Mill St from Pepper Ave to Meridian Ave from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2030     | RTP     | \$960        |
| 4120190     | San Bernardino, City   | Widen Mt View Ave from Coulston Ave to Mission Creek Channel (Zanja) from 2 to 4 lanes (SB only)                      | 2025     | RTP     | \$34         |
| 4A07264     | San Bernardino, City   | Widen Mt View Ave from Thompson Pl to Electric Ave from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2030     | RTP     | \$768        |
| 4A07247     | San Bernardino, City   | Widen Palm Ave from Cajon Blvd to I-215 from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2025     | RTP     | \$912        |
| 4A07198     | San Bernardino, City   | Widen Perris Hill Park Rd from 21st St to Pacific St from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2025     | RTP     | \$1,83       |
| 4A07244     | San Bernardino, City   | Widen Pine Ave from Kendall Dr to Belmont Ave from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2035     | RTP     | \$96         |
| 4A07148     | San Bernardino, City   | Widen Rancho Rd from Colton City Limits to 5th St from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2025     | RTP     | \$3,21       |
| 4A07135     | San Bernardino, City   | Widen Rialto Ave from Lena Rd to Tippecanoe Ave from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2030     | RTP     | \$2,88       |
| 4A07178     | San Bernardino, City   | Widen Rialto Ave from Sierra Way to Waterman Ave from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2025     | RTP     | \$2,299      |
| 4120191     | San Bernardino, City   | Widen State St from Hanford St to n/o Cajon Blvd from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2035     | RTP     | \$6,000      |
| 4A07152     | San Bernardino, City   | Widen Tippecanoe Ave from Mill St to Harriman from 4 to 6 lanes   | 2030     | RTP     | \$25,000     |
| 4A01292     | San Bernardino, City   | Widen Waterman Ave from 5th St to Baseline Ave from 4 to 6 lanes  | 2030     | RTP     | \$6,91       |
| 4160069     | San Bernardino, County | Construct Grade Separation for Vista Rd @ SFRR  | 2035     | RTP     | \$31,00      |
| 4AL04       | San Bernardino, County | Countywide Arterial Improvements  | 2035     | RTP     | \$1,340,71   |
| 4G0167      | San Bernardino, County | Extend Shadow Mountain Rd and construct 4-lane road including bridge over Mojave River and grade separation           | 2025     | RTP     | \$50,000     |
| 41404022    | Con Domondia o Country | over RR from Helendale Rd to National Trails Hwy  | 20.40    | DTD     | ¢ 40.00      |
|             | San Bernardino, County | I-10 @ Wabash Ave interchange improvements  | 2040     | RTP     | \$40,000     |
| 4A07130     | San Bernardino, County | Intersection Improvements for Daley Canyon Rd @ SR-18   | 2025     | RTP     | \$3,000      |
| 4160013     | San Bernardino, County | Operational improvements on SR-62 from East Yucca Valley Town Limits to West Twentynine Palms City Limits             | 2035     | RTP     | \$527        |
| 4A07131     | San Bernardino, County | Pave dirt road Midway Ave from SR-19 to SR-247 as 2-lane road   | 2025     | RTP     | \$3,000      |
| 4G07420     | San Bernardino, County | Replace Grade Separation and widen underpass at National Trails Hwy and Oro Grande Grade Separation from 2 to 4 lanes | 2025     | RTP     | \$29,000     |
| 4120192     | San Bernardino, County | Various ITS Projects Throughout San Bernardino County   | 2035     | RTP     | \$471,29     |
| 4A07349     | San Bernardino, County | Widen Alder Ave from Taylor St to Valley Blvd from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2025     | RTP     | \$21         |
|             | San Bernardino, County | Widen Alder Ave from Valley Blvd to San Bernardino Ave from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2025     | RTP     | \$40         |
|             | San Bernardino, County | Widen Benson Ave from Howard St to State St from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2025     | RTP     | \$51         |
|             | San Bernardino, County | Widen Benson Ave from Phillips Blvd to Howard St from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2025     | RTP     | \$57         |
|             | San Bernardino, County | Widen Calabash Ave from Whittram Ave to Foothill Blvd from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2025     | RTP     | \$1,74       |
|             | San Bernardino, County | Widen Crafton Hills Pkwy from South Redlands City Limits to Crafton Hills from 0 to 2 lanes                           | 2035     | RTP     | \$6,32       |
|             | San Bernardino, County | Widen East End Ave from Phillips Blvd to Grand Ave from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2030     | RTP     | \$30         |

|             |                        |  | Year     | Project |              |
|-------------|------------------------|--|----------|---------|--------------|
| RTP/FTIP ID | Lead Agency            | Description  | Complete | List    | Project Cost |
| 4A07099     | San Bernardino, County | Widen El Evado Rd from Air Expressway to Hopland Dr from 0 to 4 lanes  | 2035     | RTP     | \$7,200      |
| 4A07162     | San Bernardino, County | Widen Florida St from Greenspot Rd to Garnet St from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2025     | RTP     | \$409        |
| 4A07352     | San Bernardino, County | Widen Garnet St from 0.08 miles s/o Mentone Ave to Mentone Ave from 2 to 4 lanes                             | 2035     | RTP     | \$429        |
| 4A07320     | San Bernardino, County | Widen Garnet St from Mentone Ave to SR-38 from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2035     | RTP     | \$430        |
| 4A07169     | San Bernardino, County | Widen Garnet St from Newport Ave to Florida St from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2035     | RTP     | \$3,162      |
| 4A07314     | San Bernardino, County | Widen Garnet St from SR-38 to Newport Ave from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2035     | RTP     | \$383        |
| 4A07111     | San Bernardino, County | Widen Jurupa Ave from Cedar Ave to Lilac Ave from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2025     | RTP     | \$56:        |
| 4A07315     | San Bernardino, County | Widen Locust Ave from 7th St to 11th St from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2035     | RTP     | \$54         |
| 4A07183     | San Bernardino, County | Widen Locust Ave from Jurupa Ave to Santa Ana Ave from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2035     | RTP     | \$2,05       |
| 4A07188     | San Bernardino, County | Widen Locust Ave from San Bernardino Ave to Randall Ave from 2 to 4 lanes                                    | 2035     | RTP     | \$1,70       |
| 4A07193     | San Bernardino, County | Widen Locust Ave from Santa Ana Ave to Slover Ave from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2035     | RTP     | \$1,64       |
| 4A07189     | San Bernardino, County | Widen Locust Ave from Valley Blvd to San Bernardino Ave from 2 to 4 lanes                                    | 2035     | RTP     | \$1,40       |
| 4A07182     | San Bernardino, County | Widen Mission Blvd from Central to Benson Ave from 4 to 6 lanes  | 2025     | RTP     | \$1,498      |
| 4A01276     | San Bernardino, County | Widen Mission Blvd from LA County Line to Pipe Line Ave from 2 to 6 lanes                                    | 2025     | RTP     | \$1,01       |
| 4A07202     | San Bernardino, County | Widen Monte Vista Ave from Phillips Blvd to State St from 2 to 4 lanes                                       | 2025     | RTP     | \$83         |
| 4A04401     | San Bernardino, County | Widen Mulberry Ave from Jurupa Ave to Slover Ave from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2025     | RTP     | \$58         |
| 4A04115     | San Bernardino, County | Widen Mulberry Ave from Valley Blvd to San Bernardino Ave from 2 to 4 lanes                                  | 2025     | RTP     | \$96         |
| 4A07197     | San Bernardino, County | Widen Olive St from Jackson St to Rancho Ave from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2025     | RTP     | \$1,55       |
| 4A07252     | San Bernardino, County | Widen Phillips Blvd from East End Ave to Roswell Ave from 2 to 4 lanes                                       | 2025     | RTP     | \$37         |
| 4A07390     | San Bernardino, County | Widen Phillips Blvd from LA County Line to East End Ave from 2 to 4 lanes                                    | 2025     | RTP     | \$10         |
| 4A07124     | San Bernardino, County | Widen Phillips Blvd from Roswell Ave to Yorba Ave from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2025     | RTP     | \$3,02       |
|             | San Bernardino, County | Widen Phillips Blvd from Yorba Ave to Benson Ave from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2025     | RTP     | \$3,82       |
|             | San Bernardino, County | Widen Pipeline Ave from 0.04 miles s/o Philadelphia Ave to Phillips Blvd from 2 to 4 lanes                   | 2025     | RTP     | \$3,20       |
| 4A07216     | San Bernardino, County | Widen Pipeline Ave from Chino Ave to Riverside Dr from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2025     | RTP     | \$1,10       |
| 4A07061     | San Bernardino, County | Widen Randall Ave from Cherry Ave to Poplar Ave from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2025     | RTP     | \$2,79       |
| 200816      | San Bernardino, County | Widen Rock Springs Rd from Glendale Ave to Deep Creek Rd from 2 to 4 lanes (including bridge)                | 2020     | FTIP    | \$21,23      |
| 200816      | San Bernardino, County | Widen Rock Springs Rd from Glendale Ave to Kiowa Rd (0.76 miles) from 2 to 4 lanes                           | 2025     | RTP     | \$21,23      |
| 4A07033     | San Bernardino, County | Widen San Bernardino Ave from Alder Ave to Laurel Ave from 2 to 4 lanes                                      | 2025     | RTP     | \$52         |
| 4A07240     | San Bernardino, County | Widen San Bernardino Ave from Wabash Ave to Opal Ave from 2 to 4 lanes                                       | 2025     | RTP     | \$77         |
| 4120136     | San Bernardino, County | Widen Santa Ana Ave from Mullberry Ave to Almond Ave from 2 to 4 lanes                                       | 2030     | RTP     | \$3,66       |
| 4A07153     | San Bernardino, County | Widen Santa Ana Ave from Tamarind Ave to Locust Ave from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2030     | RTP     | \$2,55       |
| 4160018     | San Bernardino, County | Widen SR-247 from North Yucca Valley Town Limits to Reche Rd from 2 to 4 lanes                               | 2040     | RTP     | \$16,30      |
| 4160015     | San Bernardino, County | Widen SR-62 from Riverside County Line to Yucca Valley Town Limits from 4 to 6 lanes                         | 2030     | RTP     | \$30,68      |
| 4A07097     | San Bernardino, County | Widen Summit Valley Rd from SR-138 to Ranchero Rd from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2035     | RTP     | \$21,00      |
|             | San Bernardino, County | Widen Summit Valley Road from SH138 to Ranchero Rd from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2018     | FTIP    | \$21,00      |
|             | San Bernardino, County | Widen Sunburn Ave from SR-62 to Crestview Dr from 2 to 4 lanes; adjust vertical Profile safety               | 2030     | RTP     | \$15,00      |
|             | San Bernardino, County | Widen Valley Blvd from Cherry Ave to Hemlock Ave from 4 to 6 lanes   | 2025     | RTP     | \$63         |
|             | San Bernardino, County | Widen Walnut Ave from 0.10 miles s/o Roswell Ave to Roswell Ave from 2 to 4 lanes                            | 2035     | RTP     | \$35         |
|             | SANBAG                 | Direct Shuttle bus connection from Rancho Cucamonga Metrolink Station to Ontario Airport                     | 2020     | RTP     | \$4,00       |
|             | SANBAG                 | Double tracking of Metrolink San Bernarino Line between CP Central and CP Archibald in San Bernardino County | 2030     | RTP     | \$94,50      |

|             |             | APPENDIX B - Aggressive Scenario  | Year     | Project |              |
|-------------|-------------|---|----------|---------|--------------|
| RTP/FTIP ID | Lead Agency | Description   | Complete | List    | Project Cost |
| 4160042     | SANBAG      | Double tracking of remaining single track segments of Metrolink San Bernardino Line   | 2040     | RTP     | \$300,000    |
| 4TL204      | SANBAG      | Elderly & Handicapped Assistance  | 2025     | RTP     | \$137,000    |
| 4120215     | SANBAG      | Express Bus Euclid Ave from Foothill Blvd to Pomona Rincon  | 2030     | RTP     | \$128,695    |
| 4120211     | SANBAG      | Express Bus Grand/Edison Ave from Chino Hills Pkwy to Milliken Ave  | 2030     | RTP     | \$30,088     |
| 4120206     | SANBAG      | Express Bus Haven Ave from Banyan St to Edison Ave  | 2030     | RTP     | \$18,387     |
| 4120209     | SANBAG      | Express Bus Riverside Avenue from Sierra Ave to University Ave  | 2030     | RTP     | \$28,416     |
| 4120205     | SANBAG      | Express Bus San Bernardino Ave from Sierra Ave to E St  | 2025     | RTP     | \$15,729     |
| 4120204     | SANBAG      | Express Bus Sierra Ave from Riverside Ave to Marygold Ave   | 2025     | RTP     | \$13,372     |
| 4160001     | SANBAG      | Express Lane Direct Connectors from SB I-15 to WB I-10 and reverse, NB I-15 to WB I-10 and reverse and WB I-10 to SB I-15 and reverse | 2035     | RTP     | \$550,000    |
| 4120219     | SANBAG      | Full BRT Foothill/5th from Monte Vista Ave to Boulder Rd  | 2025     | RTP     | \$415,911    |
| 4120200     | SANBAG      | I-10 @ Alder Ave new interchange  | 2035     | RTP     | \$99,000     |
| SBD031269   | SANBAG      | I-10 @ Beech Avenue - construct new interchange with 4-lane overcrossing  | 2035     | RTP     | \$113,02     |
| 4M01027     | SANBAG      | I-10 @ California St interchange improvements   | 2040     | RTP     | \$45,00      |
| 4160004     | SANBAG      | I-10 @ Grove Ave/4th St new interchange   | 2040     | RTP     | \$128,000    |
| 4120198     | SANBAG      | I-10 @ Mt Vernon Ave interchange improvements   | 2022     | RTP     | \$37,12      |
| 4H01003     | SANBAG      | I-10 from Ford St to Riverside County Line - Add 1 HOV lane each direction  | 2030     | RTP     | \$106,80     |
| 4M01045     | SANBAG      | I-215 @ Campus Pkwy new interchange   | 2040     | RTP     | \$57,000     |
| OM630       | SANBAG      | I-215 @ Mt. Vernon/Washington St Interchange reconstruction   | 2035     | RTP     | \$109,048    |
| 4M01044     | SANBAG      | I-215 @ Palm Ave interchange improvements   | 2040     | RTP     | \$11,000     |
| 4160049     | SANBAG      | Passenger Rail Service from San Bernardino to Metrolink Line to Ontario Airport   | 2040     | RTP     | \$740,00     |
| 4120194     | SANBAG      | Redlands Passenger Rail - Add a second track/additional passing track throughout the corridor of Phase 1 project                      | 2030     | RTP     | \$183,49     |
| 4M01047     | SANBAG      | SR-210 @ Del Rosa Ave interchange improvements  | 2040     | RTP     | \$36,00      |
| 4160017     | SANBAG      | SR-210 from I-215 to I-10 - Add HOV Lane  | 2040     | RTP     | \$110,00     |

|             |                  |  | Year     | Project |              |
|-------------|------------------|--|----------|---------|--------------|
| RTP/FTIP ID | Lead Agency      | Description  | Complete | List    | Project Cost |
| 4160011     | SANBAG           | SR-60 @ Central Ave - Ultimate interchange improvements - possible ramp widening and auxiliary lanes                                     | 2040     | RTP     | \$50,000     |
| 4A01293     | Twentynine Palms | Construct new 4-lane Lear Ave/Sunfair Rd from Poleline Rd to Marine Corps Air Station  | 2025     | RTP     | \$18,500     |
| 4160014     | Twentynine Palms | Operational improvements including signal and intersection modification on SR-62 from West Twentynine Palms<br>City Limits to Morongo Rd | 2035     | RTP     | \$1,799      |
| 4A01297     | Upland           | Widen Central Ave from South Upland City Limits to Arrow Route from 4 to 6 lanes   | 2025     | RTP     | \$3,590      |
| 4M07004     | Victorville      | I-15 @ Bear Valley Rd interchange improvements   | 2040     | RTP     | \$25,000     |
| 4M1006      | Victorville      | I-15 @ Boulder Rd/Dale Evans Pkwy interchange reconstruction   | 2040     | RTP     | \$500        |
| 4M07014     | Victorville      | I-15 @ Mojave St new interchange   | 2035     | RTP     | \$50,000     |
| 4FR04       | Victorville      | SCLA - Track and intermodal yard improvements (Phases 1 through 4)   | 2030     | RTP     | \$673,305    |
| 4120227     | Victorville      | Widen 3rd Ave from 0.20 miles s/o Nisqualli Rd to 600 feet n/o Bear Valley Rd from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2025     | RTP     | \$1,400      |
| 4120228     | Victorville      | Widen 3rd Ave from 600' n/o Bear Valley Rd to Bear Valley Rd from 0 to 4 lanes   | 2025     | RTP     | \$400        |
| 4A07149     | Victorville      | Widen Amargosa Rd from Air Expressway to Village Dr from 0 to 4 lanes (includes wash crossing)   | 2035     | RTP     | \$6,000      |
| 4160022     | Victorville      | Widen Amethyst Rd from Bear Valley Rd to Sycamore Rd from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2035     | RTP     | \$1,000      |
| 4160021     | Victorville      | Widen Amethyst Rd from Mojave Dr to Dos Palmas Rd from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2035     | RTP     | \$4,000      |
| 4A07223     | Victorville      | Widen Amethyst Rd from Rancho Rd to Mojave Dr from 0 to 4 lanes  | 2035     | RTP     | \$8,000      |
| 4120235     | Victorville      | Widen Amethyst Rd from Sycamore Rd to Eucalyptus Rd from 0 to 4 lanes  | 2035     | RTP     | \$2,000      |
| 4A07285     | Victorville      | Widen Baldy Mesa Rd from La Mesa Rd to Olivine Rd from 0 to 4 lanes  | 2035     | RTP     | \$632        |
|             | Victorville      | Widen Baldy Mesa Rd from Palmdale Rd to La Mesa Rd from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2035     | RTP     | \$3,000      |
| 4A07156     | Victorville      | Widen Bear Valley from US-395 to Monte Vista Rd from 2 to 6 lanes  | 2035     | RTP     | \$8,000      |
| 4A07355     | Victorville      | Widen Bear Valley Rd from 0.5 miles e/o I-15 to US-395 from 4 to 6 lanes   | 2035     | RTP     | \$11,000     |
| 4A07096     | Victorville      | Widen Bellflower Rd from Palmdale Rd to Sycamore St from 0 to 4 lanes  | 2035     | RTP     | \$12,000     |
| 4A07331     | Victorville      | Widen Civic Dr from Mojave Dr to Roy Rogers Dr from 0 to 4 lanes   | 2025     | RTP     | \$2,000      |
| 4A07307     | Victorville      | Widen El Evado Rd from Hopland Rd to Palmdale Rd (SR-18) from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2035     | RTP     | \$5,000      |
| 4160031     | Victorville      | Widen Eucalyptus St from 0.15 miles w/o Cobalt Rd to Mesa View Dr from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2035     | RTP     | \$3,800      |
| 4A07249     | Victorville      | Widen Eucalyptus St from Amargosa Rd to Amethyst Rd from 0 to 6 lanes  | 2025     | RTP     | \$2,400      |
| 4120224     | Victorville      | Widen Eucalyptus St from Amethyst Rd to 0.15 miles w/o Cobalt Rd from 0 to 4 lanes (includes wash crossing)                              | 2035     | RTP     | \$3,600      |
| 4A07286     | Victorville      | Widen Eucalyptus St from Mesa View Dr to Bellflower Rd from 0 to 4 lanes (Victorville portion only)                                      | 2035     | RTP     | \$2,000      |
| 4A01325     | Victorville      | Widen Hook Blvd from US 395 to 0.4 miles west of Topaz Rd from 0 to 4 lanes  | 2035     | RTP     | \$4,000      |
| 4160036     | Victorville      | Widen Hook from Amethyst Rd to Topaz Rd from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2025     | RTP     | \$2,000      |
| 4A07387     | Victorville      | Widen Hopland St from 0.25 miles w/o Cobalt Rd to El Evado Rd from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2035     | RTP     | \$3,500      |
| 4A07309     | Victorville      | Widen Hopland St from US-395 to 0.25 miles w/o Cobalt Rd from 0 to 4 lanes   | 2035     | RTP     | \$5,200      |
| 4A07224     | Victorville      | Widen La Mesa Rd from Caughlin Rd to White Rd frm 0 to 4 lanes   | 2035     | RTP     | \$4,000      |
| 4A07288     | Victorville      | Widen La Mesa Rd from Mesa View Dr to Cantina Rd from 0 to 4 lanes (Victorville portion only)  | 2025     | RTP     | \$2,600      |
|             | Victorville      | Widen La Mesa Rd from White Rd to Mesa View Dr from 0 to 4 lanes   | 2035     | RTP     | \$14,000     |
|             | Victorville      | Widen Mariposa Rd from 0.3 miles s/o Yates Rd to Palmdale Rd from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2035     | RTP     | \$1,800      |
|             | Victorville      | Widen Monte Vista Rd from Palmdale Rd to Bear Valley Rd from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2035     | RTP     | \$5,000      |
|             | Victorville      | Widen National Trail Highway from Mojave River to I-15 from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2025     | RTP     | \$4,600      |
|             | Victorville      | Widen National Trails Hwy from Mojave River to 1.6 miles n/o Mojave River from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2035     | RTP     | \$3,200      |
|             | Victorville      | Widen Ottawa St from Mariposa Rd to Third Ave from 0 to 4 lanes  | 2035     | RTP     | \$6,000      |

|             |              |   | Year     | Project |              |
|-------------|--------------|---|----------|---------|--------------|
| RTP/FTIP ID | Lead Agency  | Description   | Complete | List    | Project Cost |
| 4A07023     | Victorville  | Widen Palmdale Rd from US 395 to I-15 from 4 to 6 lanes   | 2035     | RTP     | \$8,60       |
| 4A07282     | Victorville  | Widen Rancho Rd from Amethyst Rd to El Evado Rd from 0 to 4 lanes   | 2035     | RTP     | \$2,00       |
| 4A07376     | Victorville  | Widen Rancho Rd from El Evado Rd to 0.4 miles w/o National Trails Highway from 2 to 4 lanes                                       | 2035     | RTP     | \$1,40       |
| 4A01362     | Victorville  | Widen Rancho Rd from National Trails Highway to 0.4 miles w/o National Trails Hwy from 0 to 4 lanes                               | 2035     | RTP     | \$154        |
| 4A07113     | Victorville  | Widen Seneca Rd from Topaz Rd to Amargosa Rd from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2035     | RTP     | \$2,00       |
| 4A01354     | Victorville  | Widen Seneca Rd from US-395 to Topaz Rd from 0 to 4 lanes   | 2035     | RTP     | \$4,00       |
| 4A07075     | Victorville  | Widen Smoketree Rd from Topaz Rd to Amargosa Rd from 0 to 4 lanes (includes wash crossing)  | 2035     | RTP     | \$5,00       |
| 4A07359     | Victorville  | Widen Stoddard Wells from Dante St to I-15 from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2035     | RTP     | \$5,20       |
| 4160065     | Victorville  | Widen Topaz Rd from 0.3 mi. n/o Bear Valley Rd to Eucalyptus St from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2035     | RTP     | \$2,60       |
| 4160064     | Victorville  | Widen Topaz Rd from Dos Palmas Rd to Luna Rd from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2025     | RTP     | \$1,00       |
| 4A07283     | Victorville  | Widen Topaz Rd from Eucalyptus Rd to Smoketree Rd from 0 to 4 lanes   | 2035     | RTP     | \$4,00       |
| 4A07164     | Victorville  | Widen Topaz Rd from Hopland St to Dos Palmas Rd from 0 to 4 lanes   | 2035     | RTP     | \$12,00      |
| 4M04033     | Yucaipa      | I-10 @ Wildwood Cyn interchange improvements  | 2035     | RTP     | \$35,00      |
| 4A04415     | Yucaipa      | Widen 14th St from Yucaipa Blvd to Oak Glen Rd from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2025     | RTP     | \$4,40       |
| 4A01366     | Yucaipa      | Widen 5th St from Yucaipa Blvd to County Line Rd from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2025     | RTP     | \$5,21       |
| 4A07248     | Yucaipa      | Widen Ave E from 14th St to Bryant St from 2 lanes to 4 lanes   | 2025     | RTP     | \$89         |
| 4A04417     | Yucaipa      | Widen Bryant St from North Yucaipa City Limits to County Line Rd from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2025     | RTP     | \$7,79       |
| 4A01367     | Yucaipa      | Widen California St from Wildwood Cyn Rd to County Line Rd from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2025     | RTP     | \$1,53       |
| 4A01368     | Yucaipa      | Widen Calimesa Blvd from Oak Glen Rd to County Line Rd from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2025     | RTP     | \$2,82       |
| 4A01370     | Yucaipa      | Widen County Line Rd from Calimesa Blvd to Bryant St from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2025     | RTP     | \$2,49       |
| 4A01371     | Yucaipa      | Widen Live Oak Canyon Rd from West City Limit to I-10 from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2025     | RTP     | \$1,52       |
| 4A07041     | Yucaipa      | Widen Oak Glen Rd from Colorado St to Casa Blanca Ave from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2025     | RTP     | \$7,74       |
| 4A01376A    | Yucaipa      | Widen Wildwood Cyn Rd from Calimesa Blvd to Colorado St from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2025     | RTP     | \$1,35       |
| 4A01376B    | Yucaipa      | Widen Wildwood Cyn Rd from Colorado St to Holmes St from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2025     | RTP     | \$4,78       |
| 4A07022     | Yucaipa      | Widen Wildwood Cyn Rd from Outer Hwy I-10 St to Calimesa Blvd from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2025     | RTP     | \$11,90      |
| 4A04418     | Yucaipa      | Widen Yucaipa Blvd from I-10 to Bryant St from 4 to 6 lanes   | 2025     | RTP     | \$15,64      |
| 4160016     | Yucca Valley | Operational Improvements including signal and intersection modifications on SR-62 from SR-247 to East Yucca<br>Valley Town Limits | 2035     | RTP     | \$1,05       |
| 4A01386     | Yucca Valley | Widen SR-247 from North Yucca Valley Town Limits to SR-62 from 2 to 4 lanes   | 2035     | RTP     | \$15,31      |
|             | Yucca Valley | Widen SR-62 from Fairway Dr to SR-247 from 4 to 6 lanes   | 2030     | RTP     | \$20,90      |
| 4160071     | Yucca Valley | Widen Yucca Mesa Dr from Buena Vista Dr to SR-62 from 2 to 4 lanes  | 2040     | RTP     | \$5,60       |
|             | · · ·        | •   | •        | Total   |              |

 FTIP
 \$90,133

 RTP
 \$9,295,503

 Total
 \$9,385,636